

---

THE  
RIGHTS  
OF THE  
CHURCH of *England*,  
Asserted and Prov'd.

---





## A P P E N D I X.

A short Specimen of some *Scandalous Books and Libels*, collected out of that infinite Number of them, written lately against the *Church of England* by the *Presbyterians*, annex'd here to shew the *Falshood* of this Author, in so confidently affirming, pag. 1. That the *Dissenters* have been *hitherto Silent*, and are brought now with *Reluctancy* to Plague the Establish'd Church and Government, with their seditious Demands, and scurrilous Controversies.

**T**HE True Nature of the Gospel Church and Its Government.

*Clarkson* of Liturgies.

— of Episcopacy.

Rational Defence of Non-Conformity in *Rule's* Answer to Bp. *Stillingfleet*.

The Nature of Church Government freely Discuss'd, and set out in 3 Letters.

Brief Enquiry into the Nature of Schism. Vindication of it.

Defence of it.

*Baxter's* Life.

Reprimand to Bigotism.

The Apology for the *English Presbyterians*.

A Letter of Advice to the Churches of the Non-conformists in *England*.

A Letter to Mr. *Burroughs*.

Animadversions on *Calamy's* Discourse of a Scrupulous Conscience.

Answer to Dr. *Scot's* Cases concerning Forms of Prayer.

Examination of Dr. *Hascard's* Case about Edification.

*Taylor's* Consideration of Dr. *Sherlock's* Cases.

The State of the Case of Mixt Communion in a Friendly Discourse betwixt a Minister and a Non-Conforming Parishioner.

Discourse concerning Schism, design'd for the Satisfaction of Conscientious and Peaceable Dissenters.

Moderation a Virtue.

Moderation still a Virtue, with Remarks on Mr. *Sacheverel*.

A Short Way with the Dissenters.

More Short Ways.

The Test of the *Ch. of England's* Loyalty.

The Test of the *Ch. of England's* Honesty.

Antidote against Rebellion.

*Calamy's* Moderate Non-conformity.

All *Tutchin's* Observators, and *De Foe's* Impudent Trumpery; the 2 Foul Mouths of the Party.

*All which Scandalous and Rebellious Libels, with a Thousand more of their Godly Works of the same stamp, wou'd disgrace even the Hands of the Common Hang-man, to commit to those Flames, which they so highly Deserve.*

## P O S T S C R I P T.

**T**Here being just Publish'd, since the Printing of this Discourse, A Second Part of our Author's *Rights of Protestant Dissenters, being a Vindication of their Right to an Absolute Toleration, from the Objections of Sir H. Mackworth in his Treatise intitl'd, PEACE at HOME*, we thought fit to acquaint the Reader, that he may expect a full Answer to every Argument therein contain'd, that is not sufficiently Answer'd in this Discourse already; this Author's Second Performance being, in the main, nothing but Nauseous Tautology of what is even frequently Repeated in the First Part, and which we presume, is effectually Confuted. But because this Writer, for want of *timely Chastisement*, has not only Renew'd, but Improv'd his Insolence to the *Church of England* in general, and that Excellent Member and Defender of it, Sir H. Mackworth in particular, we shall give our selves the Trouble, and this Author the Justice of a little *farther Correction*.

THE END OF THE LINE

POSTSCRIPT



THE  
RIGHTS  
OF THE  
CHURCH of ENGLAND  
Asserted and Prov'd :  
IN AN

Answer to a late Pamphlet, intitl'd *The Rights of the Protestant Dissenters*, in a Review of their Case. K .

PETER *Answer'd* SIMON MAGUS,  
*Thou hast neither Part nor Lot in this Matter, for thine Heart is not right in the sight of God, Repent therefore of this thy Wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the THOUGHT of thine Heart may be forgiven thee.*  
*For I perceive that thou art in the Gall of Bitterness, and in the Bond of Iniquity. Acts 8. 21, 22, 23.*

Printed in the Year, MDCCCV.



THE  
**RIGHTS**  
 OF THE  
 CHURCH of ENGLAND  
 Asserted and Proved;

IN AN  
 Answer to a late Pamphlet intitled The  
 Rights of the Clergy in a  
 Review of the



PETER AND SIMON MAGUS  
 The best answer I can give to this matter, for this  
 Heart is not right in the sight of God,  
 Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God,  
 if perhaps the THOUGHT of mine Heart may be for-  
 given thee.  
 For I perceive that thou art in the Gall of Bitterness, and in  
 the Bond of Iniquity. Acts 8: 21, 22, 23.

Printed in the Year MDCCV.

TO THE  
HONOURABLE  
THE  
HOUSE of COMMONS  
*In Parliament Assembled.*

May it Please this Honourable House,

**T**H E hearty Zeal, and steady Resolution You have shewn, in Defending the RIGHTS of HER MAJESTY, and the Church, in Supporting the Undoubted Prerogative of the One, and the Excellent Constitution of the Other, induces Us to Hope, That an Address, wherein the Vindication of Both, is in some measure, endeavour'd, may neither be thought Unseasonable, nor prove Unacceptable to your August Assembly; at a Time, when the Eyes of the whole Kingdom are fix'd upon Their Representatives, in Expectation of seeing that Glorious Work, of Transmitting the CHURCH OF ENGLAND Secure to Posterity, Accomplish'd; which in pursuit of HER MAJESTY'S Gracious Desire, You have so Generously and Cheerfully Undertaken.

No-



## DEDICATION.

*Nothing, but the most Discerning Vigilance, and Presaging Wisdom, could incite HER to propose, and You to find out, such Means to Preserve the Establishment, so visibly in Danger; and, for which the Nation will be for ever bound to pay their most unfeign'd Acknowledgments.*

*It is therefore an Honest Ambition, as well as a Part of Our Duty, for Us to Appear in That Cause, which this Great Branch of the Legislative Power has so Nobly Maintain'd; and which One of Your Own Members has so Learnedly and Clearly Vindicated to the World, as One wou'd have thought, should have Silenc'd the Pitiful Objections of that Insolent Author, whom We have here Examined, and the Unreasonable Demands of That Party, of which He is the Profess'd Advocate.*

*In whose Name, He has presumed to Invalidate the Greatest, and most Sacred Function of the Crown, HER MAJESTY'S Supremacy in Church and State; to Represent HER Venerable Title of Defender of the Faith, as an Unjust Extent of Power, and an Usurpation in the Civil Magistrate; to traduce the Authority of Parliament, as Insufficient to make, or enforce any Law, not contain'd in Scripture, and in short to strike at the Whole Constitution; and Palm such Free-Thinking, which will end in Anarchy and Rebellion, upon Us, for Gospel and Christian Liberty.*

To



## DEDICATION.

*To Men of these Schismatical Principles it is owing, that Our Best, and most Faithful Patriots, are strangely Celebrated in Black Lists; Scurrilous Legions Publish'd to Terrify Our Legislators; that the Giddy and Unthinking Multitude are Appeal'd to, in Opposition to their Lawful Representatives; that the Constitution may be broke thorough, that Some of them may Domineer with Scandalous Licentiousness, and Uncontroul'd Impunity. These are the Men, who Plead Rights of Toleration, even above those of their Sovereign; who can call an Obligation to constant Communion with Our Church, in case of their Admittance to Offices of State, Persecution, and an Infringement of their Liberty, which this Honourable House, for the Preservation of the Church of England, has thought fit to Oblige even the Successors of the Crown to Observe.*

*And tho' Matters seem to be driven to such a Fatal Crisis, that some Measures are absolutely Necessary, to Restrain this Potent Faction, who Dare, in such Pamphlets as this Author's, to Insult HER MAJESTY, Arraign Your Authority, and Menace the Government; we shall not, like them, saucily Presume to prescribe Our Law-givers, how to redress Publick Grievances: Especially when we have a House of Commons, to Execute with so much Integrity, what is Recommended from the Throne with so much Piety.*

*That*

# DEDICATION.

*That HER MAJESTY may Live long, to render the Nation Happy, in Accomplishing all HER Just Designs, for the Perpetuating the Establishment of the Church; and that SHE may never want SUCH an House of Commons, which will omit no Opportunity of Promoting Its Interest; and that all Your Counsels may meet with that Good Success that the Almighty can give em, is, and ought always to be, the affectionate Wish, and earnest Prayer of every True English-man, that has either a Love, for His Country, a Concern for His Church, or a Zeal for His Religion.*

---

PRE-



## P R E F A C E

**T**HE Sophistical Author, that is here Examined, having, in a Tedious Pamphlet, advanced several strange Paradoxes, without offering at any Proof of them, we have been oblig'd, not only to Confute his Absurdities, to but lay down several Propositions, with their Proofs, in Opposition to them; which has made this Discourse run out into a much greater Length than was intended; especially considering that the Main Points, in Debate betwixt the Church and the Dissenters, have been so fully stated, that there seem'd to be as little Room for a New Answer, as a Fresh Objection. But it must be confess'd, that the Dissenters Improve in their Claims, however they Fall short in their Arguments. It is an Amazing Thing to the Church, to hear them not only Challenging an Absolute and Unlimited Toleration from the Government, as their Right and Property; but setting themselves upon an Equal Establishment with her; Nay, presuming this to be a Fundamental Maxim, and an Essential Part of the Constitution. All which Prodigious Assertions, and many more *Prof. §.2:* of the like Nature, we have endeavour'd to Sift to the Bottom, and Expose; both in their Falshood, and Pernicious Consequences: Tho' on the other Hand, there is not the least Argument brought in their Vindication, but that the Dissenters THINK so, and can't forbear Thinking, and are fully Persuaded, and Hope, and are of Opinion, and have always Held, and call God to Witness, that they cannot but hold such Wicked and Treasonable Tenets as shew them to be as Bad Subjects as Christians; and which Nothing, but the great Founder and Father of all Lies, could Dictate to the most Querelous, Moody, and UN-  
THINKING



# P R E F A C E

**THINKING** Set of Men in the World: Men of such Fixed Prejudice, Obdurate Hatred to the Church, and Stedfast Bigotry to their own Opinions, that they will never Own themselves Answer'd, tho' never so undeniably Confuted; because they seldom Read any thing, but what is Written by their own Illiterate Faction, and may serve to Confirm and Harden them in their Errors. If any Expressions in this Discourse may seem a little too Harsh, or Poignant upon these Men, who always Load the Church of England with the most Virulent Invectives, and Undeserv'd Calumnies, we desire the Reader to consider, what Provoking, Exasperating, Incorrigible Adversaries we have to Deal with, and whether such Resolute Sinners should be Treated with Moderation, who have the Impudence to call the Grand Rebellion in 41, an Old Story, who Arrogate to themselves the sole Merit of the Revolution, and yet Charge the Church of England's Compliance with it, as Treason, and represent Her Doctrines of Obedience as Pernicious to Kings as theirs of Deposing. Doubtless these Occasional Conformists, these Mercenary State-Hypocrites, ought as much to be Distinguish'd from the Consciencious Dissenter, as a Mistaken and Undesigning Offender, from a Deliberate and Presumptuous Criminal. However those Men may Recommend, or Intitle themselves to the Compassion and Tolleration of the Government, yet certainly a due Zeal for the Honour of God, a Hearty Concern for our Constitution, as well as Christian Charity for the Salvation of their Souls, should induce our Legislators to Imitate our Blessed Saviour, who, tho' the greatest Example of Meekness, thought it but Justice to scourge these Money-Changers out of the Temple.

p. 76. of  
this Author.

R E-

# REMARKS

Upon the **AUTHOR'S**

*Dedication to the QUEEN.*

P. 1. **S**INCE Her Majesty, out of Her great Mercy and Condescension, has been pleas'd to promise the Continuance of a *Toleration* to the *Dissenters*, in their *Religion*; it could scarce be expected, that they shou'd presume to trouble Her, with a Barefaced *Justification* of their *Principles*, under the Pretence of *Doing Justice* to Her Majesty; or have the Confidence to claim that *Toleration*, as a *matter of Right*, which is a mere Act of *Favour* and *Indulgenae*. Much less cou'd it have bin thought, that they wou'd complain of *Injuries* and *Oppressions*, whilst they enjoy'd all the Ease and Protection, which the Royal Defender of our Faith, and Church, cou'd grant, consistent with that glorious Character, and the great Zeal and Concern, She has so often profess'd for the Security of Both. A sufficient Proof, that Nothing, but an entire Giving up the *Rights*, *Powers*, and *Revenues* of the Church, into their Hands, can ever satisfy their boundless *Avarice*, and *Ambition*: To obtain which they have us'd all Artifice and Sophistry in Representing themselves under several Shapes and Figures, as Occasion offer'd, to serve a Turn; Sometimes Threatning the Government, with the Formidable *Extent* and *Power* of their *Body*; at other times, shrinking themselves into the narrow Compass of an *inconsiderable Party*, alternately to work upon our Fear and Compassion. They have here the Boldness to assert, That *they have bin wrong'd by Mis-representations of Disaffection to Her Majesty's Government, of Ingratitude and Folly*: But whether their Principles and Practices have bin traduc'd; or, whether in both, they have not shewn an Irreconcilable Enmity to all *Monarchical Government*, and particularly to Her Majesty's Title to the Throne, we may safely call in the United Testimony of *History*, and *Experience* to determine. After which, nothing, but the most amazing Insolence, could make such Men impudently appeal to *their*



*Loyalty*, and dare challenge the *Church of England*, to disprove it, which has bin so often done, to their Indelible Shame, and utmost Confusion.

P. IV. And certainly there was sufficient Reason to lay the *Dissenters* out in their Proper Colours, upon the Accession of *Her Majesty* to the Throne, to give Her an early Caution to guard Her Self against a *Restless and Inveterate Faction*, who have all along labour'd, to contrive, and accomplish the Ruine of Her Royal Ancestors, and are by Principle, Implacable Foes to Her Line and Government. We need not Consider from what Spring this their inexorable Hatred arises, to the *Best Constituted Government in the World*, whether from their *Stupidity*, or *Baseness*, their *Wilful Ignorance*, or their *Natural Inclination* to *Mischief and Villany*; whether from their *Envy* to the Church, or their *Treachery and Ingratitude* for their not being only Protected, but Trusted; Whether it proceeds from any, or rather all of these Causes, it matters not, since the Effect is Undeniable, and is equally Malignant, let it proceed from what Cause it will. If *Her Majesty's Administration* is unhappily fill'd up with too much *Toil and Difficulty*, it is in no small Measure owing, to Her being forc'd to Struggle with such a *Waspsish, and Perverse Generation of Men* at Home, whilst She is Engag'd in Wars Abroad; Who would imperiously Obtrude their groundless Pleas of *Innocence*, for an *absolute Right* to Dominion, and that, upon the Evidence of their own Bare Assertions; and who have always shew'd themselves as *Impatient of Contradiction*, as they are Incapable of being Convinc'd.

P. V. If *Her Majesty* must be Inform'd of the true Characters of Parties, and the Principles of this Set of Men, from their own Writings, and Representations, She must Frame a Judgment as False, as those Representations are Contrary to the Matters of Fact, set forth in my *Ld. Clarendon's Excellent History*, which this pert Author audaciously Reflects upon: An *History*, which by a peculiar Providence, has been laid before Her Majesty, as Her Best and most Faithful Counsellor, to admonish her to beware of the ensnaring *Amusements* of their *Pretended Loyalty*, and to avoid those specious Professions of Rebels, that brought all that Dismal Scene of Misery on Her Unfortunate Progenitors; which was both Founded in, and Carry'd on by the Principles of *Fanaticism*: Principles which will be for ever found of such contentious, fatal, and Devilish Influence, that it highly concerns *Her Majesty*, frequently to ponder upon the Conclusion, drawn from such Incontestable Matters of Fact, and to stand by it, as *Indispensably Necessary* for Her Security, never to place the least Trust in such shuffling, hollow-hearted, Underminers of her Power, but rather to Carry a more Watchful Eye over them, and to make a narrower Inspection into their dark and intricate Proceedings.

The



The Author of the Dedication of that *Noble History* to Her Majesty, ( which this Puny Scribler of a Tedious *Libel* upon, rather than a *Dedication* to Her, in Derision, calls *Pompous* ) is not such an *Obscure and Unknown Person*, as to encourage this *Wretched Upstart*, to Charge the Pen of that *Illustrious Writer*, with *Unwarrantable and Invidious Conclusions*, drawn from *Contested Facts and Principles*. But it is the usual Insolent Method of the Dissenters, to Complement Her Majesty, by casting the most bitter *Invectives*, and *Odious Calumnies*, upon Her *Nearest Relations*, as if *They were Enemies to Her Government*, and *Men of Intemperate Heat*, because they Advise Her to secure Her Self and Kingdom, by Defending that Church, which only can support Her Crown.

P. VI. For the Dissenters not to be *Silent*, or rather not to Plead *Guilty to the Indictment* of Schism and Rebellion, so long Charg'd and so fully Prov'd upon them, is not only *Disrespectful to Her Majesty*, but their pestering Her with sawcy *Clamours*, is enough to weary out Her Patience, and Force Her, tho' *Unwilling*, to Exert that Justice, which notwithstanding their frequent Provocations, and Exasperating Abuses, She has, as yet Suspended. This is, indeed, doubling their Crimes, and heightning their *Ingratitude*, with Intolterable Rudeness. A greater Instance of which, could scarcely have been produc'd, than their shameless Assertion here, in this Author, *That they have done nothing which may Forfeit, but rather Increase, Her Majesty's Confidence*; and as a Proof of it, dare Appeal to *their Behaviour of late*, than which we desire no better a Test to convince the World, both of their *Effrontery*, and its *Falshood*. For have they not ever since Her Majesty's Accession to the Throne, Virulently *Bespatter'd* both Her Self, and the *Church of England* ( here vilely Degraded into a *Party* ) whereof She has profess'd Her Self so hearty a Member, in their scurrilous and seditious Pamphlets, which have of late, like an *Egyptian Plague*, swarm'd from the Press, not even with the common Decency of Privacy, but Openly, and in the very Face of the Government, to Insult and Confront it, with Avow'd *Vindications* of that *Cursed Rebellion*, and therein the unparallel'd Murder of Her Royal Grand-Father, not only Justify'd, but Ridicul'd and Lampoon'd; and her Own Person Threaten'd, and Terrify'd with Her *Successor*, and the *Scotch Disunion*, and Independency on the *English Crown*? Doubtless Her Majesty's Prudence, knows how to Interpret, and Resent such aggravating Abuses of Her Goodness, and enflaming Provocations of Her Justice, and is better acquainted with the *common Interest of the Nation*, and the Danger the Church may incur, from their Plots and Cabals, than to repose too much Confidence in Men of such pernicious Principles and Practices equally Sworn Adversaries to Her Self, and Both.

In pursuance of these Detestable Tenets, this Author, as their Representative, sticks not to tell Her Majesty, That *She had no Right or Title to the Throne, but what they Condescended to give Her, and that She could never Quietly Possess her Kingdom, till they Nominated her Successor.* So much do these Pharisaical Saints, the Genuine Spawn of the Jesuits, take upon them to Dispose of Crowns and Scepters; whilst the *Passive Church of England*, must be content to be an Idle Spectator, and humbly to pray for a *Toleration* of Her Religion, which will here, as well as in Scotland, be most barbarously refus'd her, if they, by God's Afflicting Providence, should be permitted to Usurp the Dominion. How far the Dissenters Promoted the Revolution, is well known: Yet it must not be forgotten, (tho' they so frequently press for *Acts of Oblivion*) that when the *Church of England* lay at Stake, in the Reign of King James the II<sup>d</sup>. the Dissenters of all sorts Address'd Him to *stand by him with their Lives and Fortunes*, to carry on and compleat its Subversion \*, and have now the Assurance to boast, That *their Establishment by Law was the only Condition they would come into the Revolution upon, or at least to be laid on a Level with the Church.* So that their Compliance with the Government, was not so much to Promote a Protestant Successor, or to Curb the Exorbitant Power of the French, or Popish Party, as to Rise and Reign upon the Ruins of the *Establish'd Church.* Our Author here Insinuates, as an high Panegyrick on the Dissenters, That they *cheerfully gave and paid Taxes without any private Advantage to themselves.* Whether they paid, or not, it is certain they Receiv'd; and whilst the Nation Groan'd under an heavy Burden of Debt, they enjoy'd the Profit of our Misery, *sucking thereout no small Advantage.*

But at present, is this such a Meritorious Character, that they pay their Share towards their Protection? Would they be Exempted from the common Contribution to the Publick Safety? Is not the Advantage equal to them with us? But here it seems lies the Grievance and the Oppression, That they are not trusted in our Army, Fleet, or Privy-Council: (tho' too many of them have been Trusted there, to Betray it) It is an *Exclusion of their Rights*, forsooth, that they are not Allow'd, as their pious Cant is, to Sacrifice all to the *Innocent Principle of their honest Ambition.* It is another Obligation, they tell us, the Government owes them, that they have Religion enough to say their Prayers, and to Deprecate those publick Calamities, they have deserv'd shou'd fall on their own Heads. That is in other Words, that they don't Imitate the Abominable Examples of their Good Forefathers, and openly Blaspheme G O D, by Cursing his Vice-Gerents. As if their Crude, Affronting, Extemporary Effusions, *the Sacrifice of Fools* (in the double Scripture Sence

---

\* *Test of the Church of England's honesty.*



of the Word ) could possibly be Meritorious; which, were not GOD Infinitely Merciful, were sufficient to Blast the Success of Her Majesty's Arms, and Obstruct those Blessings which GOD has bestow'd on Her, both at Sea and Land, which these *Seditious Malecontents* Repine at, whilst they Enjoy, Acknowledge with Reluctance, Behold with Envy, Lessen with Detraction, and Commemorate with Indignation. \* These are the *Narrow and Factional Spirits*, to whom common Mercies are the greatest Dangers, and publick Disasters become a private Security; who never fail'd to Embroil the State at Home, when it Flourish'd Abroad; and, as 'twere, to Blind the Eyes of the Nation, to Counterballance Foreign Victories with Domestic Tumults. But this Fanatical Representative, according to their usual Prophane Misapplication of Scripture, has drawn a Parallel betwixt their Obedience, and that of Isaac, that they, like him, were to be Sacrific'd, like a Thank-Offering for Her Majesty's Success, had not Her Majesty, like the Angel, Interpos'd betwixt them, and Ruine. One would have thought, the many dismal Massacres, they have brought on this Church and Nation, were enough to have prevented the Appropriation of a bloody Sacrifice to themselves; and that this Abuse of a sacred Simile, could prove nothing else, but that they deserv'd to be Sacrific'd for their own Sins, instead of those of others; and it would puzzle any Man's Understanding, but that of a Dissenter's to find, who is the *Abraham* here commanded to Sacrifice 'em, and by whom, or, how the *Queen* was the *Angel*, that both enjoin'd and prevented it, or what Analogy there is betwixt them and *Isaac*, who was a Type of our Blessed Saviour, and the fam'd Obedience of the One, as they call it, and the infamous Rebellion of the Other. But they have given us too much Reason to fear (to turn and carry their Allegory a little farther) that they would have the *Church of England*, the *Ram caught in the Thicket*, to be made a substitute Sacrifice in their Place.

P. VIII. Yet our Author is pleas'd here to advance a very surprising Proposition, That the Dissenters, by being entirely disengaged from all foreign Interests, can have none, but that of the Nation, and must be always suppos'd to be solicitous, how that may be best serv'd; and are too well appriz'd of the Danger of a Disunion from Scotland upon Her Majesty's Demise, and the Occasion which that unhappy Hour would give those that are in the Interest of the pretended Prince, to execute their evil Designs, &c. This Author has forgot who it was that set the City of London on Fire, which barbarous and cruel Villany was

---

\* Witness their Notorious Behaviour on the late Victories obtain'd by his Grace the Duke of Marlborough, and Sir George Rook; who, by God's Gracious Providence, have prevented, and we hope Disappointed, all their Villanous Schemes and Projects against the Establish'd Church and Government.



put in Execution on the celebrated *Lucky Day of Oliver*, the very time \* its Destruction was doom'd in a *Cabal* in *Holland*. Neither will he know, that when we were engag'd in War with the *Dutch*, that the Dissenters held a secret Correspondence with them, that by their Intelligence, and the Conduct of several *Oliverians*, Aboard the *Dutch-Fleet*, it was Piloted into our Harbour, and by their Directions, burnt our Ships at *Chatham*. These are such Matters of Fact as seem not capable of being disprov'd, and might confirm with innumerable Instances of late, to shew what foreign Correspondence they always kept with our Enemies. It is well known in the *last Reign* how often the Dissolutions of our Parliaments were settl'd and decreed (I don't say *bought* at the *Hague*) tho' it was no difficult Matter to guess how, and from whom those surprizing Events came at home, there having been a constant Fellow-feeling betwixt the Two Parties, and a Line of Communication drawn over the Seas. Are they not at present plotting Mischief against the *Church of England* at the Court of *Hannover*, where they have sent and maintain'd their seditious Agents and Atheistical Emissaries to represent it as a *Schismatical Party*, and themselves as the Church and great Body of the Nation, if possible to poison and prepossess the Successors to the Crown, with their lewd Notions and corrupted Prejudices against It? Thus they think to carry every thing by factious Caballing, both at home and abroad, by Bribery, Subornation, and everlasting Lying, (their great *Arcana Imperii* and Mysteries of State,) and to bear us down by their impudent boasting of the Number of their *Legion*, who are always ready at the Warch-word and Signal given, to mob the House of Commons, assassinate Her Majesty, and join with any foreign Enemy to invade the Kingdom, and subvert our Church and Government. Yet they are entirely disengag'd from all foreign Interests, and can have none, but that of the Nation, by which we may be sure, they always mean their own. And least we should want a Proof how solicitous they have been in serving it, they have the Confidence and Folly to produce the *Scotch*, their dear Brethren in Iniquity and Rebellion, for an Instance: Whose Quarrels and Divisions with us, they have so heartily espous'd, and so successfully Promoted, that they have brought us under a visible Danger of a *Disunion upon Her Majesty's Demise*; and all the sad Calamities that may attend that unhappy Hour, and have given a fair Occasion for all those that are in the Interest of the pretended Prince, to execute their evil Designs. Our Author seems not here so cautiously to stand upon his Guard, but has unawares slip't a Secret which his Party will give him no Thanks for, that the most likely Method

\* See *London Gazette*, from April 26. to April 30. 1666. Num. 48.

of introducing a *Popish Successor*, and the *French Power*, is by the *Presbyterians in Scotland*, who are as much sworn Enemies, by Principle, to the Government of our State, as they are to our Church, and with whom our Dissenters in *England* never fail'd to join, for the Extirpation of Both. And as at present they stand equally divided from Both, so 'tis to be fear'd, that the Arms they are now raising, will be as Destructive to the English Monarchy, as themselves have been to Episcopacy: And can we think, upon so Glorious an Occasion as this *Universal Reformation*, this *Root and Branch-Work* as they call it, our Whigs and Presbyterians here will be Idle, forget themselves, Desert their Old Friends, Renounce the Devil and their Interest; or, that they'll be miraculously Dispossess'd of the Spirit of Rebellion, by a strange *Metamorphosis* turn Honest, have a sudden Aversion to Murder and Sacrilege, and defend that Establishment, which they never omitted an Opportunity of Ruining? P. VIII and IX. These, one would think, were Reasons sufficient to make any Government Jealous of such a Faithless and Stubborn Generation, (*who never set their Hearts aright either to their God or King, a People never to be won with Kindness, or controll'd by Laws and Penalties*) to prevent or fence against the threatening Danger of their mutinous Designs, and seditious Stratagems, which will be always found to end, as well as begin in Popery. Had the Successors of that Wise, Resolute and Victorious Princess, Queen Elizabeth, put the Laws She so prudently made against them, in strict Execution, we should have little Reason to fear, either Popery or Popish Successors. Which excellent Laws could no more be term'd unjust Hardships, than they would have been found unhappy Measures, being only necessary Guards for the Preservation of that Church and Government, which they were continually assaulting, and without which, it could not possibly have been secure from the restless Malice and undermining Treachery of these home-bred Incendiaries; and which, to speak the Truth, were only the just Effects and Punishments of those frequent Plots and Rebellions, wherewith they infested the Quiet, and hazarded the Safety, of the Kingdom. Whoever that Author was cited in this Dedication, who told Her Majesty, *That Her Royal Uncle was a Secret, and Her Father a profess'd Introducer of Popery, and Popish Successors*, He was but a bad Precedent for this Pamphleteer to imitate: the Reflection might in Decency, have bin spar'd in an Address to so near a Relation, upon whom this odious Innuendo is intended to Glance; to derive on Her the same Blackning Suspicion they have fixt upon Her whole Line. But such Men as these, being so considerable a Part of the Government, can have the Confidence to tell their King, *That Their Consent must be always*



*ways ask'd, in making Wars and Alliances ; and what is done without Their Advice, is contrary to the Genius, and Interest of the People.* Now those Deceas'd Princes, whose Ashes this Raker of Scandal so rudely Disturbs, as they were the greatest Examples of Mercy, and unparallel'd Condescension to the Dissenters, so they were the most unfortunate Precedents for it ; having by this well-meant, tho' imprudent Mildness, and over-kind Indulgence, given them the Power and Opportunity of bringing all those deplorable Troubles and Disasters upon their Heads : And tho' *Dead*, yet they seem to *speak* a secret Admonition to Her Present Majesty, the last Relick of their Royal Progeny, to Beware of Cherishing those Serpents in Her Bosom, who sting to Death their Best Benefactors, who take great Kindnesses for the worst of Injuries, who never Forgive those whom they have first Wrong'd, tho' they themselves are so frequently Forgiven ; and who Resolve to be Ungrateful for those Exceeding Favours, which they find themselves Incapable of Repaying. But, as this infamous Scribler, who rather than miss an Opportunity of Railing, would Vent his malicious Scandal on the *Dead*, so when it serves his Turn, he can prostitute his mean Flattery on the *Dead* too, perhaps as little deserving the One, as the Former the *Other*.

For to what end is an invidious Parallel, so frequently drawn betwixt Her Majesty, and Her Predecessor ? Can it be intended for any thing else, but to Lessen and Upbraid Her, with his Magnity'd and Exorbitant Praises ? Has She not as much at Heart the Liberty of Her Subjects, and the Preservation of the Protestant Religion, tho' She does not Lean so favourably to the Dissenters, as to Patronize One, in opposition to the Other ? Has She not Chang'd the Private Maxims of the Court, for the general Good and Inclination of Her People, by shewing Herself to have an Heart entirely English ? Has She Given up the Interest, Power, Trade, or Privileges of Her Own Kingdom, to Gratify, or Enrich the Avarice, Ambition, or Usurpation of Foreign Persons and Governments ? Has She not Chang'd the Intrigues of a Cabinet, for a constant Attendance on a full Council ; and has She not always follow'd the good advice of that best of Councils, Her Free Parliament, wherein there are no Court Pensioners, to buy and sell the Liberty and Property of the Subject, and to endanger Both, by stickling for a *standing Army* ; no multiplying Places, to Bribe Indigent and Mercenary Members, Men, neither of Honour, Conscience, Family, or Reputation, to Barter for, and Sacrifice their Constitution and Country ? Has She not pursued those Measures, which are necessary to secure us from the Danger of a Popish Pretender, and the Aspiring Power of France, without a Dear-bought Booty Treaty of Partition ? Has She Alienated the E-  
state



State of the Crown, Lavish'd the Immense Supplies of Her Parliaments, or Sunk the Credit of the *Exchequer*? Has She not by Her Own Care and Frugality; and the Prudent and Faithful Administration of Her Present *Lord Treasurer*, Lessen'd the *Publick Debt*, Rais'd her Own, and Retriev'd the Nation's Reputation? Has She not, to ease Her Kingdom of the heavy Burden of Taxes, generously given a large Part of Her Revenue towards the Expence of the War, Retrench'd Her Grandeur, to Advance that of Her Subjects, and Encreas'd Her Own Trouble, to Lessen their's? And yet Her Diffusive Charity has not been confin'd within the Compass of Her own Dominions; How widely has she extended it to the distressed Protestants Abroad? But to shew Her peculiar Tenderness and Concern for that Church, of which She is so Indulgent a *Nursing-Mother*, has She not Exceeded the Generosity of Her Royal Ancestors to it, and settled such a Transcendent Bounty upon its poor and laborious Members, as at once shews Her true Christian Zeal to promote God's Glory, in maintaining the Just Dignity of his Worship and Religion; and the Honour of Her People, in taking off so visible a Reproach upon them? Has She not Rais'd the most Learned and Orthodox Members of the Clergy, into the Highest and most Sacred Orders and Offices of the Church, to support its Doctrines, Exert its Discipline, and Defend Both, against its most Irreconcilable Enemies? Has She not restor'd it out of its sinking, and languishing Condition, to its primitive Splendor and Beauty? And to consummate Her Character, Have not Her Heroick Generals, by God's Good Providence, and Her Wise Conduct and Counsel, Retreiv'd the Ancient Honour of the *English* Valour, both by Sea and Land; and Humbl'd and Defeated the United Pride and Force of *France* and *Spain*? And doubtless, when Her Victorious Arms shall have brought the Haughty House of *Bourbon* to Sue for a Peace (which seems so near) She will take all possible Care to Secure the *Protestant Religion* to Posterity, (which truly might have bin an *Article of Peace*, without *Acknowledging the Pope's Supremacy*) and to Advance the *English Trade*, equal at least, to that of our Allies, the *Dutch*. If in all these things She has so Nobly Exceeded the Measures of Her Predecessor of Immortal Memory, if Her Successes have bin Greater than He cou'd Wish, or Prepare things for, We are glad to find the Dissenters own, That It was Reserved by Providence to render Her Reign Glorious, and Her Memory Precious to succeeding Ages. And We hope the Dissenters will pardon Her Majesty, if while She allows them a Free Toleration (tho' not that Establishment they expected in the former Government, which made them so forward to run all Hazards and Difficulties to secure it) She labours to Transmit the Church of England to Posterity;

which whatever Indulgence is granted to Sectarists, can never be provok'd to complain of a *Persecution*, much less, to alarm Her Majesty with the Jealousies and Fears of *Self-Preservation*.

P. x. Tho' this is the constant Method of the Dissenters, who always pretended an imaginary Notion of an *apprehended Persecution*, a sufficient Cause for Rebellion, and here obliquely threaten Her Majesty, that if the *Occasional Bill* shou'd pass into a Law, that it would prove a *Temptation to their weak and private Spirits to disturb the Publick*, to throw off that uneasy Restraint the Legislative Power shou'd think fit to lay on such turbulent and factious Malignants. Is it not then an amazing Thing to hear those Men, at the same time, talk of that *Passive Obedience they have paid the Laws*, who have bin so often, and so easily provok'd by the Devil, and their Insatiable Lusts, to enter into Measures, which (as they themselves, to their own everlasting Shame, here acknowledge) *can never secure them, nor they justify*? But what will such Monsters in Sin stick at, who have the Impudence to deny such open, and incontestable Matters of Fact, and call all their horrid Conspiracies against the Church and Government, from the Time of Queen *Elizabeth*, down to the *Rye-House Plot*, and thence to Her Majesty's Accession to the Throne, and upwards, *Sham-Plots*? As if the Legal Condemnations, Confessions, and Executions of all the Villains, convicted in this long Series of Rebellion, were nothing else, but a solemp Murder, and bloody Pageantry: As if their being Hang'd for Rebellion was to Die Martyrs, and a *Jesuit's Plea at Tyburn*, was the fittest Copy for a Dissenting Regicide to follow. Are these the *Trials of their suffering Vertues*? Can there be so foul an Aspersion upon All our Kings and Queens, and Both Houses of Parliament, to Arraign their Authority, and Question their Veracity and Justice, and to turn the Judges themselves into the Vilest of Criminals; And even this to the very Face of Her Majesty? Truly from hence we might expect, in the *Dissenter's Calender*, to see the *Apostles and Saints* Cashier'd, to make way for *Regicides in Red Letters*, and *Baxter's Saints Everlasting Rest*, (wherein some of these Confessors of Hell, are Canoniz'd,) with *Ludlow's New Gospel*, put in the place of the *Abdicated Bible*.

P. x. and XI. It is not, it seems, enough to Gratify the grasping Designs of the Dissenters, to Enjoy the Benefit of a Toleration, but they must Lessen and Degrade the *Establish'd Church*, of which Her Majesty is the Head, with the little, narrow Denomination of a *Party*. As if the Queen, because she is engag'd in the Confederacy, is as much Oblig'd by the Concern she has for the *Common Interest*, to Defend all Protestant Churches, as she is by Oath bound.



bound to Defend Her Own. Tho' Her Majesty is justly suppos'd to have a very due Regard for all Protestants Abroad, yet we hope she may be allow'd to make a Distinction of Favour to that Church, which she bears so near and honourable a Relation to, without being thought Guilty of Partiality, or *Persecution* of the Dissenters, who wou'd Engross to themselves the only Name of *Protestant Churches*; and from whom, if we are Discriminated, it can never be by *Unnecessary Terms of Communion*. Her Majesty is willing indeed to bring the Dissenters into the Church, but not by those scandalous Methods of *Occasional Conformity*; She is inclinable to Restrain their Force and Violence, by just and yet gentle Means, to make 'em Real and Entire, not *Hypocritical* and *Partial* Members of it. She would allow their Dissent, to be rather their *Misfortune*, than Fault, were she sure, that it was not their Prejudic'd Choice, and that they didn't wilfully Offend against the clearest Light, and conviction of Reason; against the express Laws of God, as well as Man. She wou'd allow their Plea of *Conscience*, did it not look too much like *Obstinacy* and *Perverseness*, and were it not a meer Term of Cant, so often us'd to cover the blackest Impiety. She knows, that Men have a *Right* to Obey the Dictates of a truly well-instructed Conscience, but that they ought not to Desecrate and Vilify that Venerable and Holy Name, by Sanctifying every singular fantastical Opinion, or sottish Absurdity, and ridiculous Prepossession of Mind, with it. She is sure, that if the Dissenters are really Men of Conscience, they can never be *Brib'd* or *Intimidated*, tho' *Civil Privileges* should accompany their *Conversion*. She wou'd consent, That Men shou'd enjoy their Opinions, if they wou'd not impudently Assert 'em with Noise and Tumult, in Opposition to Her Establish'd Religion. She thinks Men's Integrity may be best judg'd by their *Dutiful Behaviour* to the Government, and *Unfeign'd Obedience*, and yet would have the Laws vigorously Executed to enforce that Obedience, as much among the Dissenters, as the Members of her own Communion.

P. XI. The Dissenters have here the Confidence, to State the Church of England only on the Bottom of *Property*, in Opposition to all those Sects and Churches that Differ from Her. Through this Whole Pamphlet, they pretend to an *Absolute Right in their Religion*, *Exclusive of, and Previous to All Laws*: But since the Grant of the *Act of Toleration*, they Presume to be Founded on an equal Establishment with that of the Church; and consequently, look on their Religion as much a *Property* to them, as think Ours to be to us. Indeed, when a Man has a natural Right to the Exercise of the True Religion, according to the Gospel, in a Christian Country; and that natural Right shall be so enforc'd by humane Laws,

as to render the Exercise of his Religion as secure to him, as the Enjoyment of his *Property*; that Religion, with respect to humane Laws, does become to him a kind of *Property*. But then the Church of Christ owes neither its *Being*, nor *Spiritual Nature*, nor *Privileges*, to the humane Legislature, tho' it may rejoice to find it self protected and supported by the secular Arm, and the Edicts of Pious Princes, who become *Nursing Fathers* to it. Thus it flourish'd more in the Time of that Religious Emperor, *Constantine the Great*, who so well deserv'd this Character, and seem'd, by God's peculiar Providence, rais'd for its Support; than under his persecuting Predecessors, who Eclips'd its Glory. It is evident, that God made use even of Heathen Princes, to defend the Jewish Church against their Enemies; yet, this cou'd be thought no more a Disparagement to that Church, than it is to the Christian, to be Maintain'd by humane Power. Tho' our Religion is by *Legal Statutes* as much secur'd to us as our *Property*, yet does not this make it a bare *Property*, divest it of its intrinsic Nature and Excellence, or place its Being in Circumstantial? If Laws are made to preserve it, is it therefore founded purely and absolutely on those Laws; or, does it take its native Perfection from them, tho', under God, it may Owe its Security to them? The Establishment therefore of our Church on the Legislative Authority, can no more be thought to affect its inward Constitution, so as to make it only amount to a *Property*, than the Confirmation and Support of it by humane Laws, can be term'd a Distrust of God's Care over it. It being necessary (considering the Boldness and Corruption of Mankind) that *Divine Laws* should sometimes be enforc'd by *Humane*, as well as *Humane* by *Divine*. And therefore, I hope, we may justly retort the arrogant Charge of Ignorance, upon our Author, for *Entertaining so little an Opinion of our Church, and debasing it by such mean and absurd Similitudes*, being wholly unacquainted with the Nature, either of its Doctrine, or Discipline. But, tho' the Dissenters were here Establish'd by Law, all the humane Laws, that might be Enacted, could never legitimate their *Schism*, or give them the true Nature and Constitution of a Church, as failing in its very Essence, and Orders; or, endow them with true *Spiritual Advantages*; having by their *Schism* (however they pretend to be United to Protestant Churches) separated themselves, not only from the Communion of the Catholick Church in general, but from the Communion of all the particular Churches in the World.

P. XII. And yet they dare assume to themselves, the Title of being *the Truest Friends to Her Majesty's Person and Government* as, she is at the Head of all Protestant Churches; and arrogate the whole



whole Force of Her Power, to the Strength deriv'd from their Body. But if our Blessed Saviour's Maxim, which is as truly *Political*, as *Divine*, may determine this Point, If every Kingdom and House divided against it self, cannot stand, to these Men must be Owing, not onely the Weakness, but the very Dissolution of that Government; who, by being Carry'd on by a *Furious and Mistaken Zeal*, Rend it with unnecessary Separation, and intestine Faction, to its unspeakable Prejudice, at a Time when our Enemies are Boasting of their Strength and Numbers, whereby they furnish 'em with a better Opportunity of *Concerting their Measures*, without Discovery, or Interruption. And yet, These are that Faithful Part of Her Majesty's Subjects, that she is to place a Confidence in; Men, Nurtur'd, and Bred-up from their Cradles, in the Principles of Schism and Rebellion; whose secret Jealousies and Machinations, the most Mild and Indulgent Reigns cou'd never prevent, who cou'd enter into a cursed Covenant, to take up Arms against the King's Person, to secure his Royal Dignity, and to Maintain the Protestant Religion, by extirpating the Church of England. But, to Divert us from a closer Search into their Conspiracies, we find 'em here, with our Author, Shifting their own Guilt on the *Jacobites*; as if, by bringing them on the Stage, they thought to shelter themselves, as tho' they were not as dangerous Enemies to our Constitution. Now, if we were to draw a Parallel betwixt these Two Parties, we shall find the Ballance fall on that side, on which they as little expect, as they are unwilling to bear it. For as the One, out of a Principle of Conscience, is so unhappy, as not to be able to comply with the present Government; and is content on that Account, to suffer the Loss of all Temporal Advantages, and does by his upright, tho' mistaken Opinion, debar himself of all secular Rights and Privileges, and, as 'twere, exclude himself out of the Political Body of his own Country; the *Fanatick*, by being imbodyed in the Government, like a secret Canker, corrodes and preys upon the very Vitals, of it; and is ready to swallow any Oath, tho' never so impious and contradictory, and keep it as religiously as he takes it, having his *Comprehensve Latitudinarian*, stretching Conscience commensurate to his Interest, and never interfering with it; His Religion rising and falling with his Gain, reconciling God and *Mammon*, and making Christ and Belial the equal Objects of his Adoration. And doubtless, such Godly Infidels have an high Claim to the Security of Government, and may very justly boast of their Fidelity to their Oaths, who have bin forward, on all Occasions, to Swear to any thing that turns uppermost; and who, in the short Space of but One Year, cou'd subscribe to, and successively abjure a Gallymawfry of Five several sorts of Governments, and particularly that of the

the Royal Family, which yet they have here the Modesty to upbraid Her Majesty with, as if they were instrumental in its Restoration.

P. XIII. *If Her Majesty's Wisdom and Goodness reach'd no further, than these Men's unfeign'd Obedience, we might justly fear Her Government wou'd be laid on as shallow, as slippery Foundation; that She might quickly descend from a Queen, to become a Subject; be an Head of a Church, without a Body; share a Titular Supremacy In England with the Pope; and, with the Poor Episcopal-Clergy in Scotland, sue for a Toleration, and be deny'd. But our Author's good Manners is always of a piece with his Reason, who is constantly leading Her Majesty backward, and treating Her with an ungrateful Retrospect of the Miseries, and Misfortunes of Her Royal Family, and giving Her to understand, what she must expect Her self, in the like Case; by here imputing those Miseries to the Severities us'd against the Dissenters. A Falshood so full of Rudeness, Impudence and Ignorance, that nothing, but that diffusive and astonishing Good-Nature, so peculiar to this Family, (which did not only pardon, but forget their unparallel'd Villanies,) cou'd forgive! For, none but such Wretches as these, that are hardened in their Sins, beyond the Power of Grace and Repentance, cou'd ever have the Face to assert, That all the Calamities, that fell upon that unhappy Line, didn't entirely proceed from their Mildness and Clemency, and the unadvis'd Indulgence, which they gave this insidious Party of Rebels, ever thriving upon Toleration, gaining Ground by Permission, encroaching upon, defying, and at length overturning that gracious Government, under which they are so mercifully and unhappily cherish'd. And, What Advantages accrued to the Nation by the Mildness of the last Government, is sadly evident, from the execrable Swarm of Sectarists, that then over-run, and eclips'd the very Face of the Church, whilst Atheists, Deists, Tritheists, Socinians, Philadelphians, &c. (not to mention all the spurious and equivocal Breed of heterogeneous Dissenters,) flourish'd, and almost triumph'd upon the Ruines of the Establishment.*

P. XIII. XIV. The notorious and insolent Defences, that are every Day publish'd of that abominable Rebellion since *Forty One*, which is here gently smooth'd over with the Complement and Title of *Unhappy Troubles*, are but a very odd Indication how much these Men are sorry for the Wickedness of their Forefathers; and give us too much Reason to suspect, that they want only an Occasion to act over the same bloody Scene and Tragedy again, as they are pleas'd for once justly to term it. So that they sin afresh, and by renewing, partake of the Guilt of their Predecessors; nay, if it were possible,



possible; would exceed it, and are so far from being concluded under an *Act of Grace and Oblivion*, that they aggravate their Offences; and really stand in need of a *New One* to pardon them. So that the dreadful Woe, which our Saviour denounced against the *Scribes and Pharisees*, (their ancient Picture and Example, ) will, I fear, fall most deserved upon them. *Wo unto you Scribes, Pharisees, and Hypocrites, because ye build the Tombs of the Prophets, and garnish the Sepulchres of the Righteous; and say, if we had bin in the Days of our Fathers, we wou'd not have bin Partakers with them in the Blood of the Prophets. Wherefore ye be Witnesses unto your Selves, that ye are the Children of them which kill'd the Prophets, and allow the Deeds of your Fathers, and fill up the Measure of their Sins. Ye Serpents, ye Generation of Vipers, how can ye escape the Damnation of Hell?* However, they think to wipe off this indelible Stain, by urging, that their Ancestors were instrumental in the Restoration of the Royal Family. But, did they not first force the King, when they Crown'd him Prisoner in Scotland, \* to swallow their *Solemn League and Covenant*; and lest that shou'd not have bin sufficient to have bound his Soul with a Curse, did they not barbarously compel him, to sign a Declaration of the Justice done to the Idolatry of his Mother's, and the Bloodiness of his Father's House; with an avow'd Condemnation of their Treason against their Subjects, wherein he had acted under his Father, when Prince of Wales? And to palliate all these detestable Practices, their Writers of this dismal History, have endeavour'd, with all false Colours and Mis-representations, to slur over their Guilt, and desire that those Times may be bury'd in Silence, which they find themselves so incapable of defending; and, that the *Thirtieth of January* may be blotted out of the *English Calender*; upon which doleful Commemoration, and solemn Deprecation of God's Wrath and Vengeance, due to that good Prince's Blood, the Defence of our Church against *Presbytery* as much depends, as its Preservation from *Popery* on the *Fifth of November*; they being the Two great Bulwarks against, and the justest Reproaches upon, our Implacable Enemies. And this they require, upon their Meritorious Labours in bringing about the *Revolution*; as if that cou'd atone for the Murder of the Blessed Martyr, or the setting up one Prince, cou'd expiate for the deposing and massacring Another. But the Principles and Practices of the *Presbyterians* have bin always the same, the modern Dissenters abet what their Forefathers committed, and consequently (as our Author himself acknowledges) deserve the same Punishments due to those *Extravagancies*, as those words of Crimes are here slightly call'd and extenuated. But if the Di-

\* Jan. 1st. 1651.

Dissenters wou'd, in good Earnest, convince the Nation, that they don't justify these villanous Practices, let their present Ministers cease from instructing and educating their Youth, in the same wicked Principles, in their Schools and Seminaries; and let 'em draw up a *solemn Abhorrence* of the Murder of King Charles I. without palming upon us, the antiquated Imposture of a suspicious Catalogue of their *Quondam Saints*\*. But till they do this, no Prince can act unjustly, if like that God, whose Vice-Gerent and Representative he is, *He punishes the Iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children*, especially when the Children openly avow, maintain, and wou'd repeat their Fathers Guilt, and by making it their own, become actual Transgressors.

P. XIV. It is an unaccountable sort of Policy, the Dissenters have of late practis'd, to Appeal to those Writings for their Defence, which are the most direct Proofs against 'em. Among which, none could have bin more imprudently cited again, than the Excellent and most Faithful *History of the Lord Clarendon*; an History, which cannot be too often Perus'd by every English Gentleman, that has a Regard for the Security of his Church, or Safety of our Constitution. That Noble Writer has shewn the unexpected Events, and *unreasonable* Consequences, that flow'd from a *Strict* and *Just*, tho' by some thought *Rigorous*, Discipline, both in Church and State, zealously Exerted upon Men, that were contumaciously Resolv'd to Obey it in Neither. That Admirable Defender of Both, is so far from Imputing this Mischief to the *Male-Administration* of the Blessed Martyr, or the *Illegality* of the things requir'd, that he endeavours to Justify them, with the utmost Force of Argument and Eloquence, and very truly Imputes all those Disasters to the Conduct and Principles of the Puritanical Ring-Leaders of the Rebellion: who by Misrepresenting the Designs of the King and Court, as tending to Introduce Arbitrary Power and Popery, (the everlasting *Can* of the *Fanaticks* against the *Church of England*) debauch'd and misled his Subjects into all that sad and deplorable Series of Injustice, Distraction and Misery. But, *Supposing*, Things had been *Strain'd* too far in Church and State, *must Mens Minds be rank'd*, and carried on to such sanguinary Extremities? Must the King be Murder'd, and the whole Nation involv'd in Blood and Ruine, if a petty Fault, or Miscarriage be committed, or small Occasions given; must a mighty Combustion be rais'd out of a Spark, and little Crimes be punished with infinitely greater? Certainly none but those, who wish the same fatal Consequences, none but the Dissenters can lament

---

\* See the Appendix of the Rights of the Dissenters.



that they have not *the Power to screw up things to the same Pitch again*. Which as they could struggle for, under the mild Administration of King *Charles I.* so they actually do now, under as gentle a Reign, that of his Grand-Daughter, and by Proceedings, (except that of their Forefathers) *as much without a Precedent*. If we must not endeavour to divest 'em of Power, till they are capable of exerting it, we shall then find it too late to offer to disarm them, when they have the Sword in their Hands, which they yet laid down, till it was glutted with the Blood of their Opposers.

P. XV. Tho' the *Church of England* has, ever since the Reformation, appear'd with such invincible Courage, Reason, and Learning, against the Innovations and Errors of Popery, and particularly to its Honour, at a time when it lay under its severest Trial, and the most dreadful Apprehensions of it, whilst the Dissenters (to their eternal Reproach be it remember'd) not only stood by and were silent, but complemented and caress'd the Popish Agents; yet the old groundless Aspersions of *Popery* must be the continual Cry against Her, notwithstanding her indefatigable Labours to convince the World of the contrary. The *Constitution of the Church* was so fully and clearly stated, that instead of administering the least Suspicion that way, when it stood as the main Fence against Popery in the World. And that Blessed Martyr, Arch-Bishop *Laud*, who as strenuously defended its Faith by his Writings, as he nobly seal'd it with his Blood; was so eminent an Instance, both of its genuine Purity, and Apostolical Truth, as, one wou'd think, in it self sufficient, to put an everlasting Silence to so unreasonable and malicious a Slander, and to set his Own and the Church's Character above the impotent Defamations of such weak Scriblers, as this Author. For, How cou'd this Primitive and Orthodox Prelate be said to *Return to the Church of Rome*, of which he never was a Member, and which he so constantly and vigorously oppos'd? But it is the pious Policy of the *Fanaticks*, to cast these popular Calumnies at random, and to insinuate any suspicious Lye, that looks plausible, and will serve their Turn, to *blacken* their Adversaries, tho' not grounded on the least Colour, or Shadow of Pre-  
tence. No Wonder that those, who could dare to fix this false and odious Imputation on the spotless Majesty of their Royal Sovereign, should not spare the Reputation of that great Pillar of his Church. If the whole Course of their Lives, and every Action in it, that tended to evince the contrary, were not a sufficient Confutation of this unjust Reproach, yet their last Dying Speeches, on the Scaffold, might at least claim the charitable Credit that is usually given to such solemn Protestations. *But it is enough for the Disciple, that he be as his Master, and the Servant as his Lord: if they have called*

*the Master of the House, Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his Household?* However, these villainous Scandals had the Effect for which they were designed; for these imaginary Fears of Popery, were thought a very justifiable Ground to induce the Dissenters to *subvert the Church of England, without being angry with its Constitution.* Now if the meer *Apprehension* of Danger, with them is a sufficient Cause for Rebellion, (as is more than once asserted in this Author's Dedication) what Church or Government, can be secure, whenever these Men shall believe their own Dreams, or pretend to be Hag-ridden with the Bugbear Fears of Popery, and their own Fantastical Phrenzy? They run into Sacrilege and Prophaneness to avoid *Superstition*, and because they dislike'd some *Ceremonies* in our Religion, resolv'd, in their Fury; to discard all. What an absurd and ridiculous Excuse have we here for the subversion of our Church, when we are told, that it remained entire, at the same time it was utterly destroy'd? As if the Church could be entire, when all its parts were rent in Pieces, when *Episcopacy*, the Essential Constitution of it, was remov'd, *As having neither its Being, Foundation, or Doctrine from Jesus Christ, or his Apostles.* This, it seems, was only the Ruin of the Superstructures of the Church, as this Writer scurvily terms it; but 'tis well known, that the whole Body of the Church, shar'd so much in this universal Havock and Desolation, that scarce its Faith, the Rock upon which it was built, remain'd in several Places. Could then the Doctrines of the Church be said to be preserv'd, when neither its Creeds were openly profess'd in Divine Worship, nor its Sacraments duly administred, but both of 'em cast out and trampled on, by that prophane, degenerate Rout of Sects, that rose out of those tumultuous, corrupted Times of Confusion?

P. XVI. *These are Remarks which the Adversaries of our Church know to be just, and which they are sensible make good the Charges brought against 'em, for that incontestable History of the Lord Clarendon.* And certainly, Her Majesty can have no Better a Foundation for a Distrust of the Dissenters Allegiance and Fidelity, than that the same Disloyal Principles and Practices of their Forefathers, (which are here sometimes acknowledg'd to be Sinful) are yet often Justified and Abetted by the Present Body of their Successors, and particularly by this their ignorant, and impudent Representative and Advocate. From which, were there no other Argument alleged to prove it, 'tis abundantly evident, *That the Monarchy of England is not now capable of being supported, but upon the Principles of the Church of England, in Opposition to those of the Dissenters, which are directly contrary to Monarchical and Episcopal Government.* A Conclusion as infallible in Reason, as it has always bin found in Experience, and on the due Observation whereof, Her Majesty will find the whole Security of Her Crown depends.



P. xvi, xvii. This Author, according to his usual Modesty, here Asserts, *That there are no Dissenters from the Principles of the Church of England, about Government and Monarchy, but the Non-Jurors. That the Queen's Title to the Crown is Founded solely upon the Revolution. That the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, and the Denial of a Mutual Compact between the Prince and his Subjects, are Dangerous to the Monarchy, as by Law Establish'd.* To which Propositions, here Magisterially laid down, without the least shadow of Proof, it may be sufficient to Reply on the contrary, *That every Sect of the Dissenters is more an Enemy to the Principles of the Church of England, than the Non jurors. That the Queen's Title to the Crown was not solely Founded on the Revolution. That the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, and the Denial of a mutual Compact between the Prince and his Subjects, are not Dangerous to the Monarchy, as by Law Establish'd.* For have not the Dissenters always oppos'd the Principles of the Church in the Points of *Ecclesiastical and Civil Government*, maintaining a Republican Form in the One, and a Level Administration of Power in the Other? Were not Monarchy and Episcopacy equally Abhor'd, Condemn'd and Abjar'd as *Arbitrary Encroachments upon the Right and Privilege of the People, as Popish Superstition and Innovation, as the Anti-Christian Marks of the Whore of Babylon?* Did not their grand Rebellion, with solemn Renunciations, pull both down, and don't the Dissenters still, on the same Principle, separate from 'em? Whereas the Non-jurors hold both, but separate only as to the *Person*, in whom they dispute the Legal Investiture of these Powers. Upon which Account the Dissenters must be esteem'd much more dangerous to our Constitution; as being entire Enemies, to the very *essential Form* of it, especially if we consider the boasted wealthy Numbers of the One, who dare threaten and defy the Government, and the inconsiderable Paucity, and poor Circumstances of the Other, which render 'em incapable of molesting it. As for her Majesty's Right to the Crown, nothing, but the utmost Effrontery and Ignorance, cou'd induce any, but a profess'd Rebel or Madman to assert, that it was not previous to the Revolution. Had She not an undoubted Right by Her Birth, or cou'd that be forfeited by the Abdication of Her unhappy Father? The Parliament cou'd neither take away that *Former Right*, or give any *New Claim*, but for some great and extraordinary Exigences of State, permitted the Crown to rest upon *that Prince's Head*, during His Life, whom the Convention had placed upon the Throne. As for Passive Obedience, it was always known to be the settled Doctrine of the *Church of England*, as it is set forth and explain'd in Her Homilies and Liturgy. And it is indeed not only founded on the express Words of the Scripture, but it is a Doctrine so absolutely necessary for all Forms of Government, whether plac'd in the Hands of One or Many, that it is impossible they ever should

subſiſt, or be ſecure without it, For under all Forms of Govern-  
 ment, theſe inherent *Rights of Sovereignty*, muſt be inveſted in thoſe  
 who have the Dominion. Namely, that *He* or *They* muſt have  
 the Power of the Sword to put Laws already made, in Execution,  
 That *He* or *They* muſt have likewise the Power of giving the  
 Ultimate Sanction and Ratification to new Laws: That neither  
*He* nor *They* are to be reſiſted in the Execution of thoſe Laws, or  
 to be held reſponſible to the People, to be Arraign'd, Judg'd, or  
 Condemn'd at their Will and Pleaſure. For if the People may be  
 allow'd Arbitrarily to take upon 'em the Judicial, or Legiſlative  
 Authority, to hinder Laws from being Executed, or to Enact  
 new ones, without Conſent of the Supreme Magiſtrate, or to  
 Reſiſt and call him to account for his Actions, then muſt all ſuch  
 Government be wholly Precarious, without any ſettl'd Bottom or  
 Foundation to reſt upon, and liable every Moment to be ſub-  
 verted, according to the Caprice or Humour of the giddy and  
 inconstant Multitude. In ſuch a Caſe, a King or Queen of *En-  
 gland* is juſt ſuch a Titular Creature, as the King of *Sparta* un-  
 der the Dominion of the *Ephori*; and the ſame fatal conſequence  
 muſt ſuch Principles have in a Republick, which wou'd make  
 the *High and Mighty States of Holland*, as Poor and *Diſtreſs'd*, as when  
 they ſued for a Peace, and Obnoxious every Day to be *De-witted*.  
 As for the Imaginary *Mutual Compact* between the Prince and  
 People, if this Author can ſhew any ſuch thing in any Monarchy  
 in the World, ( all Monarchies being Inſtituted by God ) he  
 will give us a very ſurpriſing Diſcovery in Hiſtory, which has  
 yet lain hid a Secret from the nice Enquiries of the beſt Writers.  
 As the Monarchy of *England* is a Monarchy *Limited by Laws*, ſo  
 when the Diſſenters tell us, that they are Enemies to an *Absolute  
 Monarchy*, they can be thought to mean nothing elſe, but ſuch  
 Monarchies as are not of their *own making*, or any they can place  
 that odious Imputation upon, as a ſpecious and juſtifiable Pretence  
 for overturning them. For they have always Remonſtrated againſt  
 the Obligations of Non-Resistance and Paſſive Obedience to the Crown,  
 as being Originally, Rebels upon Principle. And when they pre-  
 tend, that the *Right of Government is Lodg'd in the People*, can any  
 Man be ſo ſtupid, as to think they are ſuch Fools, as to mean the  
 Body of the *Church of England*, to which they are Sworn and Im-  
 placable Enemies, and whoſe Deſtruction and Annihilation they  
 have Plotted, ever ſince their firſt Riſe; like a *Baſtard Brother* con-  
 ſpiring againſt the Life of the *True Legitimate Heir and Firſt-Born* to  
 Eſtate and Dominion? As for the Notion of *Self-Preſervation*, it  
 has bin before made uſe of, to raiſe and foment Rebellion, and  
 may be always alledg'd for that wicked Purpoſe, whenever the  
 miſ-grounded Jealouſies, Fears, or ambitious Deſigns of the Peo-  
 ple



ple against their Governours shall suggest it, to Molest or Depose 'em, which we need, only appeal to the many sad, and notorious Instances, in our History, to prove. The Dissenters however, are here oblig'd to this Author, for the *Illustrious Comparison* he has here drawn, betwixt them and the *Cevennois*; which, how far it may hold good, I shall not stay to enquire, but think, it is a little *odious*, and may serve, at least to demonstrate their *Self-Preserving Loyalty*: but I believe their good Friends, the *Dutch*, will give this Author no Thanks, for setting the *Cevennois* above 'em, and affirming that *They are more hearty Allies to Her Majesty, than the United States, or the Emperor*, whose Dominions she has so lately rescued out of that apparent Ruin and Desolation, the *French Arms* had almost brought them under. But this Defender of Sedition could not forbear Complementing Rebellion, tho' at the Expence of his Friends, well knowing, that this was praising themselves by Proxy; and, that the Honour he bestow'd on them abroad, would reflect back upon his own Party at home.

P. 18. The Dissenters Notions of Government are of the same wild, Latitudinarian Model with their Christianity, that leave Men under a state of Universal *Licentiousness*, to think, or act as they please. And these are their *Free Principles* (as they call them) *founded on the just Rights of Humanity*, which render 'em *Free Subjects*, to Obey, or Disobey, as they think fit, and to hold Allegiance to Her Majesty, only *Durante Beneplacito*. And was it not this, that heretofore carry'd them to *Introduce a Commonwealth to the Subversion of the known Constitution of this Kingdom*? So that here we find 'em Playing Fast and Loose with their Principles, in which they are always *Occasional Conformists*, and can, to serve a turn, either Assert, or Deny 'em, and on that Account, are more Dangerous to our Government, than *Jacobites* can be, who openly profess, and stand to their Principles.

P. XIX. The Divine Right of Episcopacy, founded upon the Institution of Christ and his Apostles, has bin so fully and solidly Demonstrated, by the Excellent Writers of the *Church of England*, that there can be nothing more said to Defend it. Yet the Dissenters (who are never to be convinc'd by Argument, or Learning) will in Defiance of both, allow the Bishops to be only *Lay-Elders*, (a *Moderate Scheme* of Episcopacy, to which some would have it reduc'd) and that their Power is resolv'd into, and dependent upon, that of the State: Tho' for some certain Reasons, best known to themselves, they are pleas'd at present, to *profess a great deal of Veneration for their Lordships Persons*, at the same time that they deny their Authority. But, to use a *Certain Prelate's* Expression applicable to this Purpose, 'The People have not such Metaphysical Heads, as to distinguish betwixt the Authority, and Person of

'a Bishop; for when their Authority comes to be question'd and vilify'd, the Veneration for their Persons, when it cannot serve 'a Turn, will soon be laid aside. And here it may be seasonably remark'd, that their Dissenting Brethren in Scotland, when they see 'em Profess such a strange *Popish Doctrine*, that *They believe Her Majesty to be Supreme in all Causes Ecclesiastical and Civil*; will pronounce their Brethren, here in *England*, *Schismatics*: The Royal Supremacy being a Notion so Monstrous, that the *Assembly of Divines* were never able to swallow, nor indeed these Men themselves, to digest it. For 'tis a Doctrine, that lies so heavy and sick upon our Author's Stomach, that we find he could not carry it out to the End of his Book, but secretly disgorges the nauseous Load, in a Corner of this Treatise. These Double-Dealers, it seems, are never at a loss for a private *Salvo* to relieve their Consciences at a Pinch, and can, with a good Grace, Lye backwards and forwards, and stick not positively to Recant this *Occasional Declaration*, in as direct Expressions denying what they so solemnly here affirm. But they scorn to be Slaves, either to their Words, or Principles, and despise a little *Inconsistency* in either. And therefore we need not wonder, why (according to the Usual Way of Contradicting themselves) they here both deny the Authority of Bishops, and at the same time tell us, *They hold it Lawful*: If so, Why don't they submit to it? The *Scruples* they pretend can never justify 'em in this: For those must be founded either upon Scripture, or Conscience: The Former cannot be, because they allow the Order Lawful, and consequently not Repugnant to Scripture. Nor the Latter, because as their Own best Casuists maintain, *Conscience* ought to submit to *Government*, in all Lawful Matters.

P. XX. But, for a Justification of the Dissenters Principles and Innocence, Our Author is pleas'd to produce a very singular Argument by Appealing to the *Dutiful Behaviour* of their Brethren in Scotland, for a confutation of that *Fam'd Maxim*, *No Bishop, no King*. Now, if the *Scotch Loyalty* is to be the Standing-Test, and Measure of that of our Dissenters in *England*, I desire to put the Controversy, betwixt Us and Them, on no better a Decision. The Wise King, that was the Prophetical Author of this Maxim, *James the First*, saw the infallible Truth of it, both in the Temper of His Subjects, and Constitution of his Government; and all the Rebellions of that Nation have bin so many Fatal Proofs of it. Have not all their Solemn *Leagues and Covenants*, even down to that they Enter'd into, on Her Majesty's Accession to the Throne, run in one continued Strain, for the Abolishment of Monarchy, as well as Episcopacy? And, have they not always made Good their Engagements, in the Extirpation of Both, when 'twas in their Power? Nay, 'tis Nonsense to imagine, that as they are the same



same *Species* of Government in Church and State, where they are *Incorporated*, the one should subsist without the other; or, which is impossible, with That which is utterly opposite to, and therefore Inconsistent with it. Have not all the Troubles and Disasters, which have bin brought of late Years on this Kingdom, proceeded in a great Measure from the Turbulency and Faction of the *Scotch*? And, have not our Dissenters in *England* constantly Join'd with them, when their Rebellion was advanc'd to a Maturity? For, they have always kept a Correspondence, as an Inseparable Fraternity, both in Practice as well as Principle; and will, by their Conjunction, if not timely prevented, prove once more the Downfal of our Crown and Mitre; and this they have openly Threaten'd us with, in their seditious Pamphlets. Tho' Her Majesty, like Her Royal Grand Father, has condescended almost below Her Dignity, to Gratify that Insatiable People, tho' she had submitted to the Subversion of the Episcopal-Church among them, and had Establish'd Presbytery on Its Ruines (which the Blessed Martyr so severely repented he had done, and which he acknowledg'd the Fundamental Cause of his Misery) yet this wou'd not Satisfy their Unreasonable Demands, without the utter Extirpation of Episcopacy in *England*, which they Declar'd in a Body of 700, or more, in open Rebellion at *Cairntable Sanquhair*; and other Borough-Towns in *Scotland*, May 20. 1703, fixing Declarations on the Marker-Crosses, That *They Renounc'd ANNE Princess of Denmark, from being their Queen, unless she would Abolish and Root-out Episcopacy in England*; and thereupon enter'd into a Solemn League and Covenant, to Disperse this Declaration throughout the Kingdom, in the Name of all the true Presbyterians in *Scotland*; and this at a time whilst the Parliament was Sitting, in the Face, and with the Connivance of the Government. And can any Man be so Sottish as to think, they will not make their Words Good, now they are Permitted to be in Arms? If our Nation does not feel the Ill-consequence of Trusting Power, in their Hands, They have both chang'd themselves, and their Old Scheme of Politicks. Let the World then judge, how far Her Majesty can depend on the Dutiful Behaviour of the Dissenters in *England*, when they Appeal here to that of the *Scotch*, as their Measure and Example. Perhaps they will have the Face to Deny this, as they do all Matters of Fact, that Exhibit their Principles and Designs; and particularly, the Solemnizing that Dismal Thirtieth of January, in Scandalous and Opprobrious Feasting and Jesting in their Calves-Head-Clubs. They tell us, *They cou'd Wish, and they Hope, and they are Apt to Believe, that there are no such things done; and if they are done, they are very sorry for it, and that they are sure the Dissenters were never Guilty of such a Barbarous and Inhuman Rite, as is the Insulting the Me-*

*mory*

memory of a Vertuous and Unfortunate Prince; and, that they Hope, that none, that Breath the same Air with Her Majesty, can be Guilty of it. And indeed 'tis Pity, that those, who are Guilty of it, should Breath the same, or any Air at all. But this Solemnity (as our Author here calls it) is so far from being Practic'd in Secret, or a Suspicion Groundless and False, that it has bin Openly Celebrated in All the Populous and Trading-Towns of this Kingdom, especially since the Revolution, And was it not high Time to make a Complaint of this Enormous Crime to Her Majesty, which so Basely and Daringly Reflected upon that Blessed Person (from whom she has the Honour to Descend,) to the Affront of our Laws, and Her Own, and the Church's Disgrace, as well as Danger? Whether this Detestable Practice is not a sad and sufficient Proof, of the Present Dissenters retaining the Rebellious Principles of the last Age, let even themselves Judge, and whether they Deserve not to be equally Punish'd, for the Crimes of their Predecessors. \*

P. XXII. Since upon the Whole then it appears, That the Dissenters have no Principles or Interests concurring, to assure Her Majesty of their Fidelity: and, since they have done so many Facts, and hold such Pernicious Principles, that ought to raise a Distrust of them in Her Majesty, they have no Reason to promise themselves, that She will by any Means, be Engag'd, either to maintain the Dissenting Assemblies, or Academies to the next Generation; or, to Allow 'em any Powers, or Capacities of Dethroning Her Majesty, Subverting the Church, and Enslaving the Kingdom.

Having thus represented the Dissenters in their true, proper Colours, and unmask'd all their seditious and dangerous Designs, in the fallacious Pretences of this Author, Not through any Private Design, or to bring Difficulties and Uneasiness on Her Majesty, and the Publick; but through a Steady Adherence to the true Interest of Her Majesty, and the Protestant Succession, to secure Both which, is the only Design of these Remarks: Having shewn the utter Inconsistency of the Dissenters Principles and Practices with any Monarchy, and particularly that of England, We may justly Pray the Almighty, by whom Kings Reign, and Princes decree Justice, to bless Her Majesty with the Discernment of an Angel of God; and, in Order to render Her Government easy to her Self, and a continued Blessing to Her People, that he would vouchsafe to Her Majesty a perfect Knowledge of her truest Friends the sincere Members of the Church of England and the most bitter and implacable Enemies of Her Person and Government, the whole Body of the Dissenters, and grant She may never Trust any of These, or Distrust any of Those.

---

\* See this Matter prov'd in Mr. Wesley's Two Treatises on the Subject, who had the Misfortune to be Educated among them, and was therefore capable of discovering their Villany, and secret Conspiracies.



THE  
RIGHTS  
OF THE

*Church of ENGLAND,*

ASSERTED and PROV'D.

In ANSWER to the REVIEW of the  
*Dissenter's CASE.*

P. 1. **I**T may seem very surprizing, that an Author who pretends to appear an Advocate for the *Dissenters* in a *Review of their Case*, shou'd introduce it with a Declamation concerning the *Eagerness* and *Frequency* of those *Attacks*, that have bin lately made upon 'em, and the *Reluctancy* which they have shewn in *Replying*. Which is here farther ascrib'd to their *Want of Leisure for Controversy*, and *Recess from Business*, to the *ill Tendency of Disputes*, and their *Consciousness of their own Innocence*, which they *THINK* so manifest to all *Impartial Judges* as to need no *Apology*: and to the *weak and insufficient Arguments of their Adversaries*, and the *unanswerable Defences of their Friends*. All which Reasons; for the *Dissenters* long Silence, cou'd not yet restrain *This very idle Fellow*, from being forward to engage in this *Controversy*, howsoever incapable of doing either good *Service to his own Party*, or *Harm to the other Side*. But it seems he expected to have gain'd no small Honour, by *Encountering a late Champion of the Church*, with whom this *Doughty Heroe* has presun'd to *Enter the Lists*; not upon any *Religious Account*, but chiefly to *avoid the Imputation of Cowardice*. Now to shew the *Vanity and Falshood* of this Representation, we need only appeal to the small and imperfect Specimen annex'd of *Books Publish'd*, within a few Years, by a *Single Party of the Dissenters*, against the *Establish'd Church*: to which if we add that *Legion of Treasonable Pamphlets and Libels* they have set out and dispers'd against the *State*, together with the *Schismatical and Seditious Writings* of their other *Sects* within the same Period, it will abundantly appear, that our Author's Reasons against *Engaging in Disputes*, drawn from the *ill Influence they have on Religion and Society*, condemns the Conduct of his own Faction. For these are so many undeniable Instances to prove, that *Neither the Obligations of Christian Charity*, nor that

See the Appendix.

P. 2.

( a )      Sedate-

- Sedateness of Mind, so absolutely necessary for the Discovery of Truth, cou'd keep 'em from that Acrimony of Spirit, and Rancour of Reproach, which gives such an Edge to Mens Minds and Expressions, and has provok'd 'em to break the Tyes of Love, the Band of Civil and Religious Perfection. Has not this cast 'em into such unreasonable and indecent Passions, as has always shew'd a Greater Concern for themselves than their Arguments. A Demonstration, that they don't think that their Conduct speaks sufficiently for it self, without having Recourse to Vindications and Apologies; that however they Flatter'd themselves, that their Doubling Behaviour was blameless, they cou'd not stand acquitted from the Charge of the most Abominable and Damning Hypocrisy in their Occasional Communion; and that the Lords Reasons for it, were not, even in their Opinion, of such Weight and Force, as not to need their Additional Fallacies. This indeed was a Practice so scandalously wicked, that it was not in the Power of Humane Reason to Excuse, much less to Justify it; and which the Charity, they pretend to the Church, and the Sincerity they owe both God and Man, must stand in everlasting Opposition to. Yet we are told, That the Dissenters have, out of Charity, Occasionally Conform'd to the Church of England, at Her Invitation to do it: Which is very fallly inferr'd from a mistaken Passage in a Sermon Preach'd by then a Private Presbyter of that Church, which contains his bare Complaint of the Dissenting Ministers, for not acquainting their People with what they granted themselves, that our Church was a Lawful Church, and such as might, in some Cases be conform'd to. And this Learned Writer, to prevent a Misconstruction of his Words, soon after Publish'd a Treatise in Defence of that Sermon, wherein he proves at large, that if Occasional Conformity to any Church is Lawful, constant Communion with it, is a Duty\*. As little can the Sincerity of Occasional Conformity be vindicated, because it is pretended, that it was in Use long before any Shew of Interest cou'd tempt the Dissenters to it. But when this Practice arose, or what Motives gave it Birth, we shall not here debate, since 'tis plain for what Reasons they continue it, who only attend our Church, when induc'd by the Expectations, or forc'd to it by the Duty of a secular Post or Interest. Did they sometimes Communicate out of a Principle of Conscience or Charity, the same Principle wou'd be of Universal and Eternal Obligation, and equally perswade at all times, to a constant Communion, when their Ambition or Advantage are not to be serv'd by it.*
- P. 1.
- P. 2.
- P. 3.

But it is here to be observ'd, to prevent future Mistakes, that our Author has industriously, or ignorantly, fallen into the same Common Error, that all the Defenders of Occasional Conformity have committed before him, in confounding an Occasional hearing of Prayers and Sermons in our Church, with an Occasional Sacramental Conformity in the Blessed Eucharist. The first, is indeed an Action, which no one can justify, that believes the Terms of our Communion, and the Constitution of our Church unlawful, which no Man can joyn in

\* Bp. Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*, Part. 2. Sect. 17.



without Sin, that is perswaded in his Conscience of their Illegality. But this *Former Conformity* is not the Matter, at present, in Debate, nor what *this Law* so much clamour'd against, was design'd to restrain; but the *Latter*, which was a Practice not known among the Dissenters, till of late, finding themselves excluded all *Civil Offices*, by the *Test and Corporation Acts*, to preserve their Interest, they thought it convenient to relinquish their old Opinions, and to strain their Consciences (which before cou'd not admit an indifferent Ceremony) to comply with what they held before to be the grossest Idolatry. This scandalous Abuse, of the most sacred Part of our Religion, the *Bill against Occasional Conformity* was intended to prevent, 'As making the Reception of the Lord's Supper the most reproachful Umbrage of the blackest Iniquity, and a woeful Rock of Offence to all Pious and Unfeigned Christians, and as letting in Rebels and Schismaticks into the Offices of the Church and State, and thereby endangering both; and, as being as inconsistent with the Dissenters own Principles, as with the Laws, which were not a sufficient Guard for the Church or State, without this farther Security, because they had found out a Means of evading their power. All which weighty Arguments, produc'd by the *Honourable the House of Commons*, and so fully demonstrated by that *Learned and Ingenious* Member of it, *Sr. Humphry Mackworth*, seem to me, by this Author's good Leave, not so *Light and Trivial*, having as yet receiv'd not the least Confutation, either from him, or any other Writer. So that we are still at a Loss, to conceive how the Dissenter's Cause can lay any more Claim to *Honesty* than *Reason*, or that *their Rights* were oppress'd by this *Bill* in Agitation only; Or, That *their Lordship's Credit and Authority* (which they stand so justly possess'd of) was so much increas'd by their being *Advocates* for the *Dissenters*, as this Author pretends; or, that those *Noble Lords*, that Voted for Passing the *Bill*, do not stand in as much Credit as those that Voted against it. It is a strange way of Reasoning from the ill Success, that the *Bill* met with, to its real Merits; an Argument which never fail'd to bear hard upon the Church, and may serve to justify the worst Persecutions it has suffer'd from its prosperous Enemies: But, I think, it may, without any Derogation from their Lordship's Honour, be affirm'd, that the *whole House* of Commons Voting for the *Bill* (who are suppos'd to be the Representatives of the Majority of the Nation) is, at least, as good an Argument to defend it, as *some of the Lords and Bishops* Voting against it, is to Condemn it.

P. 3.

Having thus shewn the contemptible Weakness of this *Author's Introduction* to this Discourse, we proceed to examine his *Review of the Dissenter's Rights*, following his own Method observ'd in it, Answering it Paragraph by Paragraph.

1. First, *We will consider the Reasons for their stated Dissent.*
2. Secondly, *For their Occasional Conformity.*
3. Thirdly, *The Right which they claim to an Unlimited Indulgence, and*
4. Lastly, *Of what Advantage the Allowance of this Claim wou'd be to the Government.*

(a 2)

P. 6. First,

P. 6. First, Their Reasons for *their Stated Dissent* amount to this, 'That the Worship due to God, is what a Reasonable Creature thinks most acceptable to him, and that therefore Dissenters, who have not this Opinion of the Way of Worship, establish'd by Law, must either forbear all Adoration of the Deity, or adore him in a different Way: That it matters not whether they are mistaken, or no, since all Men must act according to their Apprehensions, whether true, or erroneous. Now, if the Worship due to God, be always what a Reasonable Creature judges to be so, then the various and contradictory Opinions of Men must be the Measures of it. Whereby the most barbarous and ridiculous Ways of Adoration wou'd be entitl'd to the Divine Acceptance, and a sincere Pagan, or Mahometan, wou'd serve God as acceptably as the most knowing and devout Christian. This is not more an Absurdity, than a necessary Consequence of that Position, *That the Worship due to God, from a Reasonable Creature, must be what such a Creature judges most acceptable to him.* A Man indeed may be bound to obey the Dictates of an *Erronious Conscience*, yet if he mistakes Evil for Good, he will not thereby perform the Obedience due to God: In such a Case, tho' 'tis a Sin to act counter to his Perswasion, 'tis as truly a Sin to act according to it; since our Opinions can't alter the Nature of Things, or the Measures of Duty, or make God's Laws the Reverse of what they are. This our Author might have learn'd from *that Judicious Prelate* he appeals to, and that very Discourse that he cites. To suppose that every Man may follow the Dictates of his Opinion without Sin, gives a distinct *Infallibility* to the Reason of every Individual Man, and makes all Contradictions equally true. If this *Fundamental Principle*, which is laid down as the Grand Basis and Postulatum of this fallacious Treatise (and upon which is plac'd the whole Stress of a *Stated Dissent*) prove false, as it must, if there be any Truth in the World, the whole Foundation of the Dissenter's Separation is entirely overturn'd.

P. 7.

Sect. I.

Job. 20. 21

P. 8. Having thus taken a *General View* of the Separatist's Reasons, in their united Force, for their *Stated Dissent*, let us next, with our Author, examine 'em in *Particular*, First, *Those Reasons by which they justify their Departure from the Establish'd Church*; Secondly, *Those upon which they more immediately found their Obligation to Communicate with other Religious Societies.* First, *The Dissenters THINK it necessary to separate from a Church, which has so many unnecessary Rites and Ceremonies, to assert their Freedom from all Human Impositions.* To state this Matter rightly, we must consider what Power God has invested the Church with. Our Blessed Saviour having delegated the same Power to the Apostles, and by the Intervention of them, to their Successors, which he himself had receiv'd; *having sent them as his Father had sent him*; They consequently, by giving Laws to his Church, do not *Encroach* upon his Authority, but only execute his Commission, without extending it to any unjust Latitude, and that without the least Violation of our *Christian Liberty*, which may be preserv'd inviolable, whilst their Injunctions re-



restrain us from the Actual Exercise of it. For the true Nature of Christian Liberty consists, not in a *Freedom of Practice*, in arbitrarily doing or forbearing things undetermin'd by the Divine Law, but in a *Freedom of Judgment*, in esteeming such to be neither necessary, nor sinful in themselves, and is then only infring'd, when we do, or forbear them, without this Opinion of their *Indifferency*. St. Paul, the great Patron and Assertor of it, declares, That *shou'd his Meat make his Brother to offend, he would eat no Flesh while the World standeth, least he shou'd make his Brother offend*: Shewing by this Instance, how well his *Christian Liberty* might be preserv'd entire, under a perpetual Restraint of its Exercise, than which, *Positive Humane Laws* cannot lay it under greater Confinement. Nor can these Laws, by enjoining the Use, or Forbearance of *Things Indifferent* in their own Nature, constitute any *thing necessary to Salvation*, which God has not made so. This can never be pretended, when a Church prescribes Rites and Ceremonies, only as conducive to the Regularity and Solemnity of Divine Worship, not as *absolutely, and in themselves necessary to Salvation*. For the Necessity, which they derive from this Injunction, is only *Relative and Consequential*, arising purely from a Command suppos'd, which if they can't receive, without an *Unwarrantable Alteration in Religion*, then by Parity of Reason, the *Civil Magistrate* has not the Power to enjoin any thing undetermin'd by God's Law, how requisite soever for the Publick Good: Since he makes thereby the same Alteration in Mens Duty, and the Terms of their Salvation, obliging 'em to do some things *for Conscience sake*, which, antecedent to his Command, they might have omitted without Scruple. For these Reasons, a Command that Men should receive the Blessed Eucharist, in the significant, tho' indifferent Posture of Kneeling, is not the least Usurpation upon their Conscience, being warranted by those General Directions of St. Paul, to do *All things decently, and in Order, and to obey those who have the Rule over us*, a sufficient Foundation for all Ecclesiastical, innocent Ceremonies; and Obedience to such a Command is consistent with the greatest Freedom of Judgment and Conscience, since the Ground of that Obedience is not any absolute Necessity of the thing commanded, but the Necessity of obeying our Lawful Governours, in all things that are left by God under their Discretion, and are concluded under no Divine Prohibition. These Principles of Universal Freedom from Humane Impositions, strike at the Root of all Government, as well Civil as Ecclesiastical, and supersede the Power of all Laws in either. I can't here think my self oblig'd to vindicate our Church from *Encroachments* upon that Authority, which God has lodg'd in any Members of either Families or Churches, since her Adversary accuses her for it, without offering at the least Proof or Instance, and that in such general and loose Expressions, as don't admit of any certain Interpretation or Reply; and argue nothing so much, as that a fair Proposal of this Objection, would have too much display'd the despicable Weakness of it. But we ought not here to forget that these Men, who have such an irreconcilable Aversion to all *Humane Impositions*, cou'd formerly in England,

1 Cor. 8.  
13.

1 Cor. 14.

40.

Heb. 13,

16.

## The Rights of the Church of England

England, as their Brethren do now in Scotland, punish the Professors of the Doctrines of the Episcopal Church, with Imprisonment, Confiscation of Goods and Estate, Banishment, and sometimes Death; which forsooth, is no Violation of *Christian Liberty*. But the Truth is, the *Christian Liberty* the Dissenters plead for, is an unbounded Licence to think an act as they please, in Contradiction to all wholesome Laws, that these singular, wild, *Self-Opiniators* shall reproach as *novel, fanciful* and *corrupt*; a comprehensive Account of their own Enthusiastick Faith and Religion.

- P. 8. §. II. The second Reason for *Stated Nonconformity*, is the Want of a further Reformation in the FAITH and Worship of the Church of England. Now those *Articles of Faith*, the Profession of which, is a Condition of Communion in our Church, are summ'd up in the three Creeds, *those Forms of sound Words*, that contain the *First Principles of the Oracles of God*, which Fundamentals of Christianity, at the Reformation, all *Protestant Churches* subscrib'd, and at present do, or ought to adhere to. The same Rule of Faith obliging 'em to retain the Belief and Profession of these, which required 'em to renounce the Anti-Christian Errors of Popery. Our Author, not having represented the particular Exceptions of his Party, against these excellent Summaries of our Faith, and so many learned Vindications and Expositions being extant in our own Language, I shall think it needless to add any Apology for 'em; But shall be more particular upon this Head, when our Author has told us, what Articles of our FAITH we are desir'd to sacrifice to *Peace and Unity*, and the Scruples of our Dissenting Brethren: Whether they can't *statedly* join with us in our Profession of the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Satisfaction or Resurrection of Christ; by discarding which or how many Branches of our Creed, they desire to equal the Honour due to our Reformers, for rejecting the Absurdities of the Roman Church; And whether their Ambition to imitate those in the perfect Reformation of the Faith, will be satisfy'd, till, according to the Scheme of their Great Patron, they have contracted it into *One Article*; and lastly, whether the Profession of this One, ought to be rigorously insisted on? But upon Examination, Innovations in the *external Worship* of our Church, will appear as unnecessary as Innovations in her Faith and Doctrine. Her Ceremonies are grave and decent, neither distracting Mens Devotion by their Variety, nor lessening it by the Difficulty of their Performance. Many of 'em recommended by the venerable Authority of the Primitive Church; Others endear'd to us by the Practice of the Holy Apostles, and even the Example of our Blessed Saviour himself. And all of them warranted by their great and peculiar Significancy, their admirable Fitness to express what is intended by them. By the Advantage of our Liturgy, as being a Set-Form, our Congregations offer up their Prayers with greater Understanding of what they ask, than the Separatists can; with more assurance that it is good and acceptable to God, and without Interruption in their fervent Attention to it, either from the Weakness or Failures of their Teachers, or the Admiration of their Abilities. And he that further considers the Excellency of this Set-Form, how peculiarly



peculiarly it is suited even to the private Cases and Occasions of all that use it, how well it expresses our awful Distance from God, and yet close Dependence on him, through the Merits of our Redeemer, how qualify'd it is to excite in its Hearers those Affections, upon which the Prevalence and Acceptance of Mens Prayers depend, must own, that no Humane Composure wants less Amendments; and that nothing but the most obstinate Frowardness, and perverse Itch of Change, can induce Men to insist upon either its Abolishment, or Alteration, as the Condition of their Conformity. To recommend such a Liturgy as this, to any One's Admiration, no mercenary Prospects, no Persuasions of secular Interest need be made use of; and to condemn it with Sincerity, the darkest Ignorance, or most inveterate Prejudice must be requir'd. And what else, but these corrupt Causes, join'd with Envy, Pride, and Ambition, cou'd induce these Adversaries of our Church to require to see it disrobed and stript of *all its Emoluments* and Honours, the greatest Eye-Sore and *Blemish* (as they call it) that *Blinds their Sight*, and is *that Vail* which they wou'd have *taken away*, to expose it naked and defenceless to Contempt and Poverty. Here indeed we are oblig'd to our Author, for not exercising that Hypocrisy he justifies, but plainly speaking out the Sense of *His Party*; the Church, it seems, to make her *Reformation Perfect*, must be dismantl'd of her Fortifications without, as well as her Doctrines within; her Lands and Dignities confiscated into the Enemies Hands, to compound for their Conformity. Then doubtless the Way will be open for them, all Objections remov'd, and Plunder and Sacrilege will wonderfully purify and cleanse it. But we have not yet so much forgot what Effects this Christian Way of *Reformation* in 41 had upon it, to desire to see the same lamentable Tragedy acted over again; and we hope this charitable Author, and his Pious Brethren, will excuse us complying with their kind Proposals, tho' *they do envy their Forefathers the Honour of having it on foot, and are so ambitious of carrying it on to a greater Perfection, and of imitating their happy Spirit, by removing these worldly Obstacles of true Piety, which their Ancestors suffer'd to remain, only to bring over the Roman Catholics.* This indeed, would be a most effectual way to follow the *Arabian Proverb*, as our Author calls it, to *put out the Churches Eyes to make her see clearly.* To answer which learned and wise *Apothegm* with as good an Application, this would be much the same sort of Remedy the Physician practic'd upon the *Old Woman in the Fable*, whom they cur'd of her Blindness, by stealing all her Plate and Jewels. But I hope our Church will stand in need of no such *Religious Quacks* and *State Mountebanks*, whose Cure (to go quits with our Author for his Proverb) is alway worse than the Disease.

P. 9.

P. 9.

P. 9. §. III. And since it therefore appears, that the *Church of England* is guilty of no *sinful Impositions*, nor wants any *Reformation* in her Faith and Worship, the Dissenters can be under no *Obligations* to Form themselves into *Separate Religious Societies*, and to erect Private Conventicles, under the fallacious and arrogant Supposition of being *Churches*, which our Author afterwards, with more Truth and Modesty, calls by the proper Name of *Confederacies*, being so many Combinations of Schism and Rebellion,

## The Rights of the Church of England.

Rebellion, that profane the Name of a Church, by the impious Application of it to Barns and Stables; as if such Places could be sanctify'd by their unclean Guests, and become the House or Temple of God.

P. 9. §. IV. Nor will the *Edification*, or *Discipline*, they pretend to be found in their separate Congregations, prove a better Justification of them. For neither of these *Spiritual Advantages*, which they so vainly boast of, in the *Choice of their Teachers*, and the *Correction and Reproof of their Assemblies*, can be any ways so visible among them, as they presume they are deficient in the Church. As for the *Choice of One's own Pastor*, it is a thing as contrary to *Reason*, as *Scripture*, and the purest Practice of both the *Jewish*, as well as *Christian Church*. For those who stand in the greatest Need of Information in any kind, are upon that Account least capable of judging, who can best inform them. Since to discern the Superiority of One Man's Knowledge above Another's, some considerable Skill in what they profess, is requisite. For which Reason the Generality of the Christians, so few of whom, for want either of Leisure, or Diligence in the Study of Religion, are qualify'd to estimate the Abilities of the Pastor, would be more probably misled by one chosen by themselves, than by such as should be assign'd to them by One chosen by competent Judges. Besides a Man is so far from being sure, that his own Choice in this Case is disinterested, that he ought very much to suspect his own Prudence, and impartiality in it. Since the Generality of Men, who are in Love with their Vices, must detest the best Qualification of a Pastor, an undaunted Freedom in Reproving, and listen with the greatest Complacency, to those, who *Prophecy smooth things*, and indulge Men in their Crimes, from whom they are never likely to hear, what ought, with the greatest Force and Courage, to be put home to their Consciences. Thus the most Edifying Teacher, that ever address'd himself to the World, has been hated and rejected by it, and even postpon'd to *Scribes and Pharisees*, because *their Deeds were evil*. The very Original Ground of the Schism in the Church of *Corinth*, was the same, that is here alledg'd by the Dissenters for their Separation from our Church, which was so severely reprehended by the Apostle: Some styl'd themselves the *Followers of Paul*, some of *Apollos*, some of *Cephas*, and others of *Christ*. Yet their different Opinion of these several Teachers, did not justify the forming themselves into different Sects. Tho' *St. Paul's Bodily Presence was in the Eyes of some weak*, and his *Speech contemptible*, who were more affected with the Preaching of *Apollos*, a Man eloquent and mighty in the *Scriptures*; yet the Pretence of Profiting by Sermons, cou'd not warrant their disturbing the Order, and breaking the Unity of the Church: For their Edification depended, not so much on the Gifts, or Abilities of him that planted, or him that watered, as upon the Blessed Operation of the Divine Spirit, that always gives the Increase. And, if we consult the ancient Practice, both of the *Jewish*, as well as *Christian Church*, we shall find, that in the First, God by his own Authority immediately constituted his sacred Ministry; and in the Second, as our Blessed Saviour himself Elected and Commission'd his Apostles and Disciples to Preach the Gospel to the World; so in the first and purest Ages of Christi-

1 Cor. 1.  
12.

1 Cor. 10.  
10.

As 18.  
84.



Christianity, it is evident from the express Testimony of *Clemens Romanus*, and *St. Cyprian*, that the Pastors were then appointed by the Apostles, and their Successors, the Bishops, and that the People, in their Elections of them, were only *Witnesses of their Consecration*, barely expressing their Approbation of those, who were thus appointed, that they were *well reported of for good Works*. Which Appeal to the People, the *Church of England* does admit of, in her Office of Ordination. But in the corrupter Ages of the Church, when its Rights began to be encroach'd on, and usurp'd by the Laity, *Popular Elections* of the Clergy were, sometimes for *Peace*, irregularly allow'd, which yet afterwards prov'd of such a contrary Effect, that the Church found her self oblig'd to assert her own Right in the Designation of her Officers, to prevent those Feuds and Divisions, and even Murders, that were frequently committed, in those Quarrels which always attended these Elections of the \* People. And among the many Inconveniences of it, this is not the least, that the pernicious Principles of *Popery* and *Heresy* (which the People can never be suppos'd capable of distinguishing from the Truth) may, as they actually have been, instill'd into 'em by *Jesuits*, and other *Impostors* in Disguise, in Conventicles. But among the many Misrepresentations of this Author, he has, in this Point, done Injustice to the very *Presbyterians* themselves, who do not always allow their separate Congregations, the Power of Electing their Ministers, who are frequently impos'd upon them by their *Elders* and *Synod*.

P. 10. §. V. As for the Objections against the *Discipline* of our Church, no one cou'd have expected her own Complaint of the Want of the strict and rigorous Execution of Discipline in the Primitive Church, to have bin retorted upon her as a Reproach, when at the same time, she expresses her zealous Wishes to see it restor'd, if the Circumstances and Conditions of the times would bear it. And much more surprizing is it to find this Cavil brought against us by the Dissenters themselves, who gave the first Rise to, and have ever since bin the greatest Cause of this Defect and Obstruction of Discipline. For have they not always oppos'd what Discipline is left, and since the Toleration, taken care to render all Discipline ineffectual? The Defect whereof is here ascrib'd to Two Reasons, the *Want of good Orders*, or a *good Constitution to execute 'em*. But what incoherent Nonsense is it to suppose, that the Levelling and Confounding the Orders of the Church, (whose Distinction is prov'd by the Testimony and Practice of all Antiquity, and which shews her strictest Conformity to the Primitive Model,) should any ways contribute to the Restoration of Discipline; or, that the Constitution of the Church could be more impower'd to exercise its Discipline, by the Abolition of Episcopacy, which is essential to its Constitution? It can never be prov'd, that a Parity of Pastors tends more to support and retrieve the Discipline of the Church, than the

---

\* See this Matter fully stated in *Bp. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*, P. 3, Sect. 25.

Superiority of some above others, any more than that *Popular* Forms of Government are better adapted to the Execution of Justice than Monarchy, however these may be thought the Two *Darling Principles* of the *Presbyterian* Religion and Polity. But supposing there was such a Defect of Discipline in our Church, as this Author would insinuate, and the ill Examples of the Lives of its Members were a great Reproach to its Constitution and Government, yet even this was no sufficient Plea for the Dissenter's Separation from it. For the Number and Impunity of its corrupt Members cannot Unsanctify the Religious Services of the Rest: Nor are these Services the less acceptable to God, because not arising from the Publick Fear of Censure and Penance, but rather shew a more singular Ingenuity of Mind, and a more dis-interested Love of God, as perform'd without the Influence of Punishments, in Opposition to so many ill Examples. So that no good Man's Concern for his own Salvation, cou'd induce him to separate from any sound Part of the Catholick Church, tho' its Discipline should be decay'd or imperfect. But here we may observe the Dissenters manifest Inconsistency with themselves, for clamouring in this Paragraph for Discipline; and in another part of this Pamphlet, declaring against all Penalties whatsoever, as an Infringement on their Christian Liberty: without which Penalties, no Discipline can subsist. Tho' at the same timewe are told, that the Primitive Discipline is restor'd in the Dissenting Congregations. But is Penance and Excommunication in greater Perfection among them than in the *Church of England*, or who ever knew the real Exercise of any such thing in a Conventicle? Or, if there be, it is kept so private, that we never heard of it, and must be a very odd Way of correcting a *Notorious Offender*. We should be glad to know, if there is any such Power, in whose Hands it is lodg'd, whether the Administration of it is in their Clergy or People, separately or jointly, how far it is extended, whether always adapted and proportion'd to the Nature and Guilt of the Offence, whether exercis'd Judicially, in any Synod, Court or Consistory, or Arbitrarily, at the Minister's Will, and in short, how they came by this Power, and whose Commission they act under, as Delegates. Have they Enacted or Publish'd any Ecclesiastical Laws, Injunctions or Canons, whereby the Discipline of their Congregations is to be regulated? Or are the Lives of their Members so strict and exemplary above those of the *Church of England*, as to supersede the Use of any such Laws; Rather to speak Truth, are not their Assemblies the Receptacle of the most profligate and dissolute Sinners, when cast out of the Church by its Discipline, as unworthy its Communion; There they never fail to find a Sanctuary, and oftentimes to be *Sainted* and *Canoniz'd* for their Lewdness and Impiety. What a contradictory, absurd Scheme of Discipline has this Author here propos'd, to restore it to the Church by taking it away from her, and in Order to comply with her Injunctions, to erect Altars in Defiance and Opposition to 'em, and to shew their *Conformity* by their *Separation*.

[ P. II.

P. II. These



P. 11. These are all their Reasons for their *Stated Dissent*, which we hope we have prov'd altogether invalid, as to a *Stated Dissent*, but to those that think 'em otherwise, they must at least be conclusive against their *Partial Conformity* to our Church. How far a Man is bound by his *Erroneous Opinion*, has been already consider'd; and if the Dissenters act like Men of *Honest Principles* (as they do frequently boast) it is impossible for any of 'em to Communicate with that Church which they equally Charge with *Deficiency* and *Redundancy*, without bringing on themselves the justest Imputation of the most inexcusable *Hypocrisy*; as allowing themselves, on *Occasion*, *Partially* to do that, which they *Totally* Condemn: and which, according to the Position of this Author, is to *Affront God, and defraud him of his due Honour, by giving him a Worship which is less, when it is in their own Power to give him what is more acceptable to him.*

P. 12. §. I. For which Reason, those that entertain this false Notion of the Church's *Deficiency* and *Redundancy*, and their own Religious Societies being preferable to it, cannot esteem it a *Good and Lawful Church*; and consequently, according to the Argument of this Author, cannot in Conscience *Occasionally* Conform to it: Because (as he says) *Every Man is bound to offer the most perfect and acceptable Service that he can to the Deity.* And whilst They think the Church is guilty of introducing *Impositions* and *Superfluities*, and allowing several *Defects* in it, they must hold it to be an *Unlawful Church*, and would be guilty of a *Sin* against their Consciences if they should Conform to it. So that the Dissenters both Believe and Act a Contradiction, in holding the Church, and their Conformity to it, both *Lawful* and *Unlawful* at the same time. But this stuff is palliated with as weak an Argument drawn from their *Charity*, That they condescend to *Believe great Numbers of the Church-Men to be among the visible Saints on Earth, and that they will make a good Part of the Church of the First-Born in Heaven.* This Complement we are obliged to 'em for, but they only give it us in order to have it return'd back upon themselves, desiring us to Believe the same of them, because they Conform to us in the Sacrament. But should we in Charity believe both them, and some Members of the Church of *Rome*, whose Ignorance is Invincible, to be of the Number of the *Visible Saints*; yet ought we not to Conform with the latter, in the *Eucharist*, whilst we think 'em guilty of *Idolatry*, nor the Dissenters indeed with us, whilst they think us guilty of the same *Crime*, as their Authors tell us. For no Man can Communicate with a Church, which he takes to be *Erroneous*, without in some measure partaking of its Errors: And therefore the Dissenters must involve themselves in the Guilt of those Sins, which they falsely impute to the Church, whilst they *Partially* Communicate with Her. But still the Dissenters urge, That they do not joyn with us in any faulty *Parts of Worship, which would be Sin against their Conscience*, (a strange *Metaphysical* way of Conforming to a Church, by *Abstracting* it from its Errors) but they Communicate with us in such Things and Occasions,

in which they can do their Country and Religion Service. But on settling this single Point, in a great measure, lies the Turn and Stress of this whole Controversy. If Occasional Conformity to a Church, which we take to be *Illegal* (as our Author's Reasons conclude) be a Practice *Evil in it self*, the Consequences of it, can never alter its essential Malignity, nor the Advantages it produces, ever justify its Goodness, according to that Maxim of Eternal Truth, on the Violation of which the Apostle has pronounc'd no less a Punishment than *Eternal Damnation*, *That we ought never to do Evil that Good may come of it*, Rom. 3. 8. The Dissenters believe us to be guilty of Idolatry in the Sacrament, and yet can be Idolaters with us to serve their Religion and Country; which in other words is, that they will stick at no Knavery, or Hypocrisy, to serve themselves. But can they seriously think us such Fools, or are they themselves such Sots as to believe, that either God, or Man, the Church, or the Nation, can reap any Honour, or Benefit, from that which is the most ignominious Flaw and Reproach upon them? Our Church as little wants, as desires the Service of these *Judas's*, who wou'd only Kiss and Complement her, more effectually to Betray her. But the same *Services* that oblige them *Occasionally* to Conform to some Parts of our Worship (which they both allow and condemn) shou'd, if they were true to their Country, oblige 'em to a constant Conformity. But with what Shew of Reason or Integrity; can any One *Statedly Dissent* from what he holds it lawful *Occasionally* to Conform to; unless it be that he holds it only lawful upon the Account of secular Interest *Occasionally* to Conform to that, which he *Statedly* Dissents from, because he holds it *Simply* unlawful? As if the same thing was *Absolutely* and *Essentially* a Sin, and *Occasionally* no Sin at all. Do not these Men justly deserve that Character, that St. Paul gave of himself whilst a Persecuting Jew, and under a State of Sin, as one wou'd think was *Prophetically* spoken of 'em; Men that are carnal, and have a Law in their Members warring against the Law of their Mind, bringing them into Captivity to the Law of Sin, which is in their Members. For that which they do, they allow not, and what they would that they do not, but what they hate that they do. But Happy is the Man that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.

Rom. 7.  
14. &c.

P. 12. §. II. This Shuffling Author being beaten out of these fallacious Subterfuges, has another Hold to retire to, out of which we will immediately Unkennel him: Tho' he has labour'd here to perplex his Reader, and lose him in a Labyrinth of Sophistry. He has, we must confess, a very difficult Part to play, and stands in need of the Pity and Forgiveness of his own Party, for managing it so untowardly. He endeavours here to reconcile the Two vastest Contrarieties in Nature, that is the Occasional Conformist's Principles with his Practice, and to vindicate him from the Inconsistency charg'd on him, in complying with those Injunctions of the Church, which he affirms to be Ecclesiastical Usurpations and Encroachments on his Christian Liberty, which no One can in Conscience comply with. In order to which, he distinguishes be-



betwixt the *Imposition of an Indifferent Thing*, and the *Indifferent Thing Impos'd*, asserting, that a *Man* may not countenance and abet the *Former*, tho' he don't altogether abstain from the *latter*. For tho' constant Receiving the Sacrament upon our Knees, wou'd be a Compliance with the Prescription of our Rubrick, yet he who *Generally* receives it in a different Posture, and but *Occasionally* in a Posture of Kneeling, pays no Submission, and gives no Countenance to it. By the dextrous Application, of which Distinction, this *Legerdmain* Reasoner doubts not to reconcile the *Occasional Use* of all other Ceremonies with their Notions of *Christian Liberty*, and *Humane Impositions*. To examine this Matter closely, and shew our Author's Inconsistency in Reasoning, as much as that of the *Occasional Conformist* in Practice; we must remember, that P. VIII of this Treatise, we are told, That a *Command to kneel at the Sacrament is an Usurpation on Mens Consciences*, and an *Authority that no Commission can be produc'd to support*, that it is in it self an *Imposition NOVEL, FANCIFUL and CORRUPT*, an *Encroachment on the Divine Right our Saviour has to give Laws to his Church*, an *Intrenchment upon the Liberty of his Subjects*, an *Alteration of Religion*, and a *Constituting something else necessary to please God*, besides that which he has made so. And yet here we are told, that *Kneeling at the Sacrament is an indifferent Thing*, perfectly an *Indifferent Thing*, and which the *Dissenters may use*, if they think fit, and that the *Imposition does not alter its Nature*, or of an *Indifferent Thing make it Unlawful*. What wretched Shifts and Absurdities is this dodging Writer put to, to cast false Colours upon things whose Native deformity can never be conceal'd? In one Place, it is an *Usurpation upon our Christian Liberty*, and in the Other none at all; there the *Command* makes it from *Indifferent* become *Sinful*, here it does not in the least change its Nature; there he betrays his *Christian Liberty* in complying with it, here he preserves it *Inviolable and Entire*. Nay in both Places the *Imposition* makes the *Action Lawful and Unlawful* at the same time, in the Opinion of the *Dissenters*, which must *debar them from concurring to it*, *abetting it*, or *giving it any Countenance constantly*, but *Occasionally* they may: As if a Sin by being practis'd once only, or a few times, were no Sin, and the frequency alone, or Continuation of it, gave the Act a Malignity in its Nature, or as if there was no Flagrancy in it, but what it had from Custom. Our Author would have made an excellent Casuist for *Naaman the Syrian*, and helpt him out with this kind Salvo of His Idolatry. He could have seen no Harm in his *Bowing in the House of Rimmon* *Occasionally* with his Master, because he kept his Commission by it. But to reconcile these huge Contradictions, we are told, Page the Eighth, That a *Man* may comply with the *Usurpation*, but not with the *Principle upon which that Usurpation is founded*. Whoever *Voluntarily* complies with any *Usurpation upon his Christian Liberty*, cannot but be suppos'd to comply with a thing, which he himself takes to be *Illegal*; *Usurpation* implying an *Encroachment on our Christian Liberty*: But whosoever complies with any thing

thing Illegal, must either do it against his Conscience, knowing the Injustice of it, or else out of Ignorance, not understanding the Obliquity of it: The Dissenters cannot do this out of Ignorance because they believe *Kneeling at the Sacrament an Usurpation*, they must therefore comply with it against their Conscience, unless they will own it a thing Legal in it self, and then they ought to comply with it *Universally*. However, when they think it *Legal* or *Illegal*, they cannot deny but that they own the *Authority* that commands it, by complying with it. For 'tis a most ridiculous Absurdity, to suppose a Man to pay an actual voluntary Obedience to any Law, without acknowledging the Legislator's Power, so that *He that complys with an Usurpation, cannot but comply with the Principle upon which it is founded*. From all which it is manifestly apparent, that the Proposition, which is laid down by that *Worthy and Judicious Senator, Sir Humphry Mackworth*, remains as yet Unanswerable, notwithstanding the Cobweb Distinction of this Author, *That the occasional Conformists Conform to that from which they Dissent, and Condemn themselves in that which they Allow, and are Guilty of a Wilful Sin*, P. 6. §. 5, 6. And that to Dissent *statedly* from a Thing which they hold *unlawful*, and yet *Occasionally* to Conform to the very same thing, and hold it *lawful*, is a palpable and gross Contradiction, if there is any such thing in Nature. As for our Author's Instance of *Occasionally Eating Flesh or Fish in a Popish Country, upon Wednesday or Friday, or a Believing Corinthian's eating Meats offer'd to Idols*, it proves nothing to his purpose, unless he can shew what he wou'd insinuate, That not only the Posture we receive the Sacrament in, but the very Sacrament it self, is a Thing altogether as *Indifferent* in its Nature, as either of the Instances he produces,

P. 14. §. III. Having thus prov'd the *Practice* of the *Occasional* Conformists to be Inconsistent with their Avow'd Principles, we proceed to consider what our Author farther urges in their Justification, namely, *That Occasional Communion is a Practice built upon the Communion of Saints, enjoin'd by the Rules of Charity, and Warranted by the Apostolical Example*. But can this Writer be thought serious, or in earnest to say this? Is the *Communion of the Saints Occasional*, or are the Dissenters *Saints* for using *Occasional Communion*? The Communion of Saints is the constant uninterrupted Union of the invisible Triumphant Church in Heaven, with the visible Catholick Church on Earth, in one Body, under one Head, *Jesus Christ*. But, how can the Dissenters pretend to be in Communion with the Body of Christ's Church, who being separated from the Communion of the Church on Earth, cannot lay any Claim to the Communion of that in Heaven? Much less can they defend either their Schism, or Occasional Conformity, by the Rules of *Charity*. Whoever peruses that admirable and full Description of it, set down by the Apostle, in the 13th Chapter of the First Epistle to the *Corinthians*, will scarce find Schism, or Occasional Conformity, rank'd among the Properties of *Charity*, to which they stand in opposition, as being the greatest Violations of it. But we shall speak fur-



further on this Point, in the Sequel of this Discourse. And, I believe, on Examination, we shall find St. Paul's Example, on which this Author lays so much stress, as little favouring this wicked Practice, as his Doctrine, which I shall therefore search to the bottom. The two Things, upon which our Author founds his Comparison of St. Paul's Practice with that of the Occasional Conformists are, First, *That the Assemblies of the Jewish and Gentile Converts (with the former of which he Occasionally Communicated, and Statedly with the latter) bear an exact Proportion to the Establish'd Church, and Dissenting Congregations in England.* Secondly, *That the Reasons of St. Paul's Stated Dissent, and Occasional Conformity bear likewise an exact Proportion, to those for the Stated Dissent, and Occasional Conformity of our Separatists.* In order therefore to overthrow the false Supposition they have form'd to themselves from this Example, I shall briefly shew, that it can't be fairly pleaded in their behalf on either of these accounts. And First, *The Assemblies of the Jewish and Gentile Converts don't (as our Author pretends) bear an exact Proportion to the Establish'd Church, and Dissenting Congregations in England.* He makes the Parallel between them to consist in this, *That the Governours of the Jewish Church, like those of that Establish'd amongst us, impos'd the Observation of many things Indifferent in their own Nature, which had been enjoin'd by God, for a Term of Time, that was then expired, and that the Gentiles, like our Dissenters, were reputed Schismatical for their neglect of them.* But certainly this must appear a very groundless Parallel to any, that compares the Decrees of the Jewish, with the Canons of the English Church: For do not these expressly condemn the Separation of our Dissenters as Schismatical, and require their constant Conformity to our Publick Worship? And did not the other, as may be seen in the 15th of the Acts, as expressly release the Gentiles from the Observation of the Mosaic Rites? Did not St. James and the Elders, even when they advis'd St. Paul to Conform to the Temple Worship, acquit them from all Blame, notwithstanding their Dissent from it? As touching the Gentiles which Believe, we have written and concluded, that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offer'd to Idols, and from Blood, and from that which is strang'd, and from Fornication. Acts 21. 25. Since therefore the same Power of the Church, which warranted and authorized the Nonconformity of the Gentiles, condemns that of our Dissenters, this Author most irrationally, and without any Shadow of Resemblance between 'em, make the One a Precedent and Pattern for the Other. Nor Secondly, is he less unhappy in imagining, *That the Reasons of St. Paul's Stated Dissent from, and Occasional Conformity to the Jewish Church, bear an exact Proportion to those for the Stated Dissent, and Occasional Conformity of the Separatists.* For can the most prejudic'd Person in the World conceive, that he, who speaking to the Jewish Church, gave that Glorious Testimony the Faith and Practice of their Governours, Heb. 13. 7. Remember them which have the Rule over you, who have spoken unto you the Word of God, whose Faith follow, considering the end of their Conversation, should, at the same time, think those very Men guilty

guilty of an Encroachment upon the Legislative Power of our Blessed Saviour, or of introducing Corruptions into the true Faith and Worship, or of Neglect to excite those under their Care, to a holy Life, by seasonable Reproof and Correction? Or will our Author say, that the great Apostle of the *Gentiles* communicated *Statedly* with them, for Benefit of choosing his own Teacher, or that he who went up to *Jerusalem* to worship, when the *Holy Ghost* witness'd in every City, that *Bonds and Afflictions* did abide him, conform'd Occasionally to the *Jews* upon Motives of Interest, for worldly Grandeur or Profit, the chief Perswasions of Occasional Communion amongst us? Neither cou'd St. Paul be said to do this, to *Promote the Service* of the *Jewish Church*, tho' a strict Jew before his Conversion, Cut to advance the Propagation of the Gospel. To conclude this Point, which has been so clearly stated by other Writers, \* this Parallel will never be found to hold, either with Regard to the *Gentile Converts*, who cou'd never be said to separate from the *Jewish Church*, of which they were not Members, and the Dissenters who *Statedly* separate from the *Church of England*; or with regard to the different conditions of the Church in its Infancy then, and Establishment at present or with regard to the *Jewish Ceremonies*, and those of the *Church of England*, the First whereof were Types and Shadows of the *Messiah*, instituted by God, to cease after his Appearance, and which, in the *Apostles* time, among the *Jewish Converts*, were rather Matters of *Charity and Prudence*, than of *Conformity or Nonconformity*, and wholly indifferent, as lying under no Command or Prohibition of any Law: Whereas the other being rather decent than typical, are enjoin'd by the Church and Authority of the Apostles for *Edification and Order*, not to be abolish'd as the *Jewish Ceremonies* were; unless this Author and his Brethren, the Dissenters, can shew any new Commission to disobey these Ecclesiastical Powers, and to erect a new Church and Religion with the Apostles, in Opposition to that already establish'd.

P. 15. But this Author, to defend his *Occasional Conformist* among the Dissenters, is pleas'd to suppose there may be an *Occasional Nonconformist* among Church-Men, who may be justify'd upon the same Principles, But who this very MODERATE CHURCH-MAN is, that can go to a Conventicle, and receive their pretended Sacrament there *Occasionally*, and yet *Statedly* Communicate with the *Church of England*, we are as much at a Loss to know, as I hope this Author is to prove. Certainly no true Member of the *Church of England* can entertain such loose and profligate Opinions of his own Church, as to Communicate with such Persons as are cast out of its Body, by their Separation, and its own Discipline; and who can never pretend either to the Being, Constitution, or Name of a Church. But this imaginary

---

\* *Occasional Conformity a most unjustifiable Practice. A Letter to a Friend from Oxon, to prove Occasional Conformists guilty of Schism and Hypocrisy. Wolf Street, &c.*



Practice, we find here defended by another *Apostolical Example*, that of *St. Peter*, who is describ'd as a *Stated Communicant with the Jewish Church* establish'd by Law, and an *Occasional Communicant with the separate Assemblies of the Reform'd Gentiles*, and consequently that a *Church of England Man* may Occasionally conform with a *Gentile Dissenter*. Now it may be remember'd on this Author's Principles, that a Man is bound to offer God the most perfect Worship in his Power, and that 'tis the most provoking Affront to him, to give him a less acceptable Service, when we are capable of giving a better. On which account, whosoever thinks the *Assemblies of the Dissenters Lawful*, but the *Church* preferable to 'em, is oblig'd by his Perswasion, to Communicate, not only *Statedly*, but *Constantly*, with the *Latter*, and not for only the *most Part*, but *always* to pursue the Course, which tends most to his Spiritual Improvement. Neither is this contradicted by *St. Peter's Practice at Antioch*, which since our Author urges as a Precedent for *Occasional Conformity*, he must suppose, that in this Apostle's Opinion, the Churches of the *Gentile Profelytes* were *Good and Lawful*, but that of the *Jewish Converts* BEST, as being zealous of the Law, which the *Gentiles* neglected. Whereas nothing is more clear from Scripture, than that he thought neither of 'em inferior or preferable to the Other, on that Score. He had bin instructed by a Vision *Not to think any Man common or unclean*, from which he rightly argued, that *God was no Respector of Persons or Nations*, but the *God of the Gentiles as well as the Jews*, accepting in all Nations indifferently those who do his Will, and work Righteousness. This yet more fully appears, from his Speech at the Council of *Jerusalem*, when the Question under Debate was, Whether the Believing *Gentiles* were oblig'd to keep the Law of *Moses*, which he oppos'd with the greatest Zeal and Earnestness, and in such a Manner as shew'd that the Neglect of the *Jewish Ceremonies* wou'd not, in his Opinion, render their Worship less acceptable, *God (says he) has put no Difference between us and them, purifying their Hearts thro' Faith*, and concludes, *We believe that thro' Grace we shall be sav'd even as they*. Acts 15. 9. and 11. Than which Words none cou'd have more fully express'd his equal Esteem of the *Jewish* and *Gentile Churches*, and his Perswasion that the Diversity of their Rites, gave neither, a Precedency to the Other, in the Divine Favour. So that *St. Peter* did not Communicate *Statedly* with the *Jewish*, and *Occasionally* with the *Gentile Churches*, as thinking One preferable to the Other, nor therefore does he warrant, by his Example, *Occasional-Non conformity*, as this Writer groundlessly asserts. But supposing *St. Peter* had shewn a little too much Zeal for the Ceremonies of the *Jewish Church*, and once had bin carried away by it, erroneously to refuse Communion with the *Gentiles*, for fear of giving Scandal to the *Jews* (which *St. Paul* reproves him for) yet this Apostle's Prejudice and Frailty, in this Case, wou'd be no Argument for a Member of our Church Occasionally to Conform with the Dissenters, who can never justly pretend to the Apostolical Institution of a Church. So that the *Hypocrisy* and *Disimulation*, that our Author says *St. Paul* charg'd upon *St. Peter*, ought properly to be retorted on our Occasional Conformists.

P. 16. Our Author goes on to display the *Latitudinarian* Principles of the Dissenters, and, in the next Paragraph, presents us with a sort of *Free Thinkers*, Men of Vast and COMPREHENSIVE Spirits, who scorn to be confin'd within the narrow Bounds of any single Church, who neither renounce our Communion, nor *Statedly* adhere to the Dissenters, who equally esteem Church and Conventicle, and think the Orders of those that Officiate in both, alike Valid and Legal. They make no Difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, betwixt Forms of Prayer, and Extemporary Harangues, and are above Observing the little Marks, and *Pedantick* Peculiarities whereby Religious Societies stand distinguish'd from each other. They can be Occasionally, Papists, Jews, Turks, Infidels, Hereticks, Quakers, Deists, Socinians, Atheists, or what not, as the Caprice takes 'em, and it suits best with their present Humour or Interest. These *Christians at large* (if they can lay any Claim to that Name,) have their Faith always to choose, and their Principles (if they have any) at Command, and frequent the

P. 16. *Communion of Episcopal, Presbyterian and Congregational Churches indifferently, as Circumstances and Occasions happen to determine and invite, in which they act as correspondent to themselves, as either of the former Occasional Conformists do.* That there are such a party of COSMOPOLITES, such Vagrants and Ubiquitarians in Religion, Men equally of All and None, must be own'd to the Shame of the Nation, and the scandalous Abuse of the *Act of Toleration*, which because our Author cou'd not defend by the *Scriptural* Examples of St. Peter and St. Paul, he has endeavoured to justify them by the *Pagan* Precedent of *Diogenes*. And it wou'd be highly for the Advantage of the State, if these *Citizens of the World* would follow their great Predecessor's Example, confine themselves, like that Sage Philosopher, to Preach out of their *Tubs*, and renounce their Relation to all particular Communities, as they have already done to Churches. It may be remember'd, that some of 'em, in a *Papish* Reign, cou'd conform to other Religious Assemblies, besides those of Protestants, tho' by a lucky Chance, they were seasonably re-converted at the Revolution: for they are always directed by \* *That First and most Fundamental Law of Nature, Self-Preservation*, and are therefore ready to comply with any novel Scheme of Government and Religion, that they think they can gain by.

P. 16. §. IV. Our Author proceeds in the next Paragraph to assert, *That it is as lawful and consistent for a Church-Man, or Dissenter, to go sometimes to a Meeting, and sometimes to a Church, as for a Church-Man to go sometimes to a Cathedral, sometimes to a Parish-Church, at one time to a Church under Episcopal Jurisdiction, at another to one exempted from it; That we can't find the Unlawfulness of going to Meetings upon any Defect of their Orders who Officiate in those Assemblies, since many of the Dissenting Ministers, whose Congregations we yet condemn as Schismatical, were Episcopally Ordain'd: And, Lastly, Since our Laws*

---

\* Dedication to the Queen, P. 18.



have granted some Privileges to the Dissenter's Congregations, as well as to the Church, they can't see any difference between *Worshipping God in the One or the Other*. To which we Reply both with regard to the *Legality and Consistency* of this Practice. The Laws and Canons of our Church prohibit its Members all Communion with separate Congregations, and therefore no True Church-Man can go to any Meeting, without a known and deliberate Violation of those express Injunctions. Which at the same time require his Attendance, either in a Cathedral, Exempt, or Parish-Church, according as his Residence happens to be, because in all these, there is the same Uniformity in Worship, One Publick Liturgy, which is the same, Said or Sung, One Priesthood, One Confession of Faith, One Hope, and the same Charity and constant Visible Communion, which Unites 'em in the Body of *Christ*. But these things being in a great measure Deficient in the separate Assemblies of the Dissenters, no sincere Son of the Church can lawfully Joyn with 'em, and be consistent with his own Principles. I know not what Law the Dissenters can urge for their Occasional Communion with the Church, either from the Act of Uniformity, or Toleration; but certainly 'tis equally inconsistent with their Principles to go sometimes to a Meeting, and sometimes to a Church. For the Dissenters thereby make a solemn Profession of that *Faith*, into which they pretend Fancy and Interest have introduc'd the greatest *Corruption*, and of which they demand an *immediate Reformation*. They sometimes Worship God after a manner which they don't think most *Acceptable* to Him, and at the same time declare, That *the Worship due to Him ought always to be such*: They pay Submission to the *Rubrick*, and term it an *Ecclesiastical Usurpation*, not innocently to be comply'd with. In a word, They do all those things, which the Laws of God and Man have made Signs and Tests of a sincere Adherence to our Church, without the least Intent of continuing longer in her Communion, than their Interest or Ambition can be serv'd by it. Upon all which Accounts it is manifest, that it is not as *Lawful and Consistent* for a Dissenter, to go sometimes to a Meeting, and sometimes to Church, as 'tis for a Church-Man, to go sometimes to a Cathedral, and sometimes to a Parish-Church. As for 'the certain Immunities and Privileges, granted by the Act of Toleration to Conventicles, their Toleration can by no means be thought to infer their *Establishment*, any more than the Toleration of a Bear-Garden, Play-House, or Stews can make 'em *Legal Religious Societies*. Since the Act that Tolerates Conventicles never Revers'd the *Preceptive Part*, nor therefore the Obligation of any Laws made against these separate Assemblies. But supposing Conventicles were not only Tolerated, but Establish'd, yet would they be never the less Sinful and Schismatical: Since those who Officiate in them as Priests, never receiv'd any sufficient Commission to execute that Function, and consequently usurp an Authority they have nothing to do with: Or, if they ever did receive it from Bishops, (of which, if there can be alleg'd any, they must be very few Instances) yet they have Renounc'd it, by Disown-

P. 6.

P. 3.

## The Rights of the Church of England

ing and Revolting from that Power from which they Receiv'd it. So that their Relinquishing our Church, may be very justly esteem'd as an Abandoning its Authority, a voluntary Resignation of its Gifts and Offices, and an Apostacy, not only from the Communion wherein, but the Hands whereby they were Ordain'd. And to gather Churches out of *lawful* and well-constituted Churches, and without cause, to erect Altar against Altar, is to defeat that solemn Prayer of our Dying Lord, that *His Followers should be one, as he and his Father are one*; and it is the grossest Violation of that Divine Precept, to *Glorify God with one Mind, and one Mouth*, and of those innumerable others, which so earnestly recommend, and so strictly enjoin *the Preservation of the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*.

P. 18. §. V. From the *Lawfulness* and *Consistency* of the Occasional Conformists Practice, let us next pass to its *Expediency*, which this Author urges as the most proper Method, *to Root out Party in the State, and Bigotry in the Church*. But certainly nothing can be found to produce this happy Effect in any Nation, but Agreement in Matters of Faith, and Uniformity in Worship. We need only appeal, for the Truth of this Assertion, to the undoubted Records of our own History and Experience, which abundantly convince us, that the Church was never Rent with Schism, but the State Sympathiz'd in its Calamities: And that the Members of the same Society can never differ in their Religious Persuasions without Hatred and Resentment, nor agree without Union and Confederacy. The Propagation of Christianity it self, where it did not perfectly displace the *Jewish* or *Pagan* Worship, was attended with this ill Consequence, that *It divided the Father against the Son, and the Son against the Father*. Nothing but a general Indifferency to all Religion, the worst and the rarest Quality, that can befall any People, can preserve so much as Civil and Social Unity betwixt those who Disagree in their Creed, and in their Modes of Adoration, As unlikely is it, that those who thus differ, should place their Religion, rather in the great Articles and Duties of it, than the peculiar Tenents and Practices of their respective Sects: That Self-Love and Pride should not determine 'em to measure their Sanctity, and Orthodoxy, more by their Opposition to each other, than the Conformity of their Manners and Opinions to the Gospel. No Practices therefore, which Cherish and Multiply different Religious Sects, in any Nation, can ever be thought to tend to extirpate *Faction* and *Bigotry* out of it, which will be always on the contrary, found the inevitable Consequences of it. For no Tranquility in Church or State, can be expected under such a Variety of opposite Interests, unless Uniformity in Mens Judgments, and their Agreement in Faith and Worship, be suppos'd the necessary Condition of it. But our Author (who always places his *Goodness in his Gain*) is of Opinion, that nothing can be so likely or *Expedient* for an Universal Union in Religion, as an Equality of Rights to Employments, *which opens a Door to all Honest* DIS-  
SEN-



SENTERS and MODERATE CHURCH-MEN whom he constantly couples, being indeed both of the same spurious Breed and wicked Alliance) to enter into Preferment: That it is no matter, whether a Man goes either to Church or Meeting, so that he does but profess himself a Christian in general; and by pretending to inward Worship, can get himself advanc'd into any profitable Post or Office; that he may be better qualifi'd to serve his Church and Country, in Betraying both, of which he was never a sincere, or true Member. Is it not to be justly fear'd, that not only Men of Sense, but even the Common and meanest sort of People will, and cannot but judge such Men's real Principles from their open Examples, and conclude, that their whole Religion lies in Places, their Conscience in the Exchequer, and their Rights in Dominion? And when Religion is thus lessen'd, by this disgraceful Notion, nothing can keep up its Credit and Power from being gradually sunk, and at last eradicated out of the World.

P. 18. §. VI. The last Topick, from which this Writer recommends Occasional Conformity, is, that it is highly serviceable to the Church, in tending to induce such as practice it, to a constant Communion. But what Use or Service that can bring to the Church, which utterly overturns and destroys its Religion, is a Paradox which we desire this inconsistent Writer to explain, with the rest of his Contradictions. But to use his own Argument against him, supposing that Occasional Conformity shou'd be a likely Means of reconciling some Dissenters to the Church, Occasional Nonconformity, which our Author says is *mutatis mutandis*, founded upon the same Principles, will, on the other Hand, seduce as many to the Conventicle. So that it will do as much harm to the Church, on the one side at least, as can be pretended it will Good on the Other. For if Partial Communion with the Church is, according to this Author's Principles, as likely to pass into Constant Conformity, then its necessary Attendant, Partial Communion with the Dissenters must be allow'd as likely to pass into as constant Nonconformity. The former of these Effects our Author resolves into the gross Stupidity, which disposes most Men to account things either altogether, and at all times Good, or altogether and at all times Bad, and the same general Infirmary of Mankind, tends equally to produce the latter. But to prove that Occasional Conformity may pass into constant Communion, this Author alledges the Words of a Great Prelate, producing the Consequence of the Bartholomew-Act in 62. as an Instance of it. We deny not but that some Men at that time, through Fear of Losing those Preferments, which they till then enjoy'd, or a Prospect of getting Better, might be brought by these Mercenary Motives, either in themselves, or in their Families, to a constant Conformity to the Church. But this Fact is equally as good a Reason to pass the Bill against Occasional Conformity: Because it may prove a means of inducing those, who Occasionally Conform for a Place or Office, Constantly to Conform, to keep it. But the Advantage the Church is like to have from such False Converts, has not been found of such great Service

P. 15.

*Service* to Her, as to encourage Her to open Her Arms to embrace such as have *always serv'd themselves* in enjoying Her Revenues, and let slip no occasion of Betraying or Deserting that Communion, when their Interest invited, the only Hypocritical Ground it was built upon. To put this Instance a little higher: Supposing any Man should out of Principle Abjure Episcopacy, and yet afterwards, upon the View of One or Two Thousand Pounds a Year, shou'd not only *Occasionally* Conform to, but sustain that Order, which he had renounc'd before as *Illegal*: I say, only supposing such a thing, which God forbid should ever befall His Church, wou'd not such a Time-serving Apostate be a foul Stain and Reproach upon the Dignity he bore? Cou'd we think he wou'd sincerely believe or assert the Doctrines of the Church, maintain its Discipline, or support its Rights and Privileges; wou'd not this *Demetrius*, this Crafts-man in Religion, who adores his *Diara* for the *Gain of the Silver Shrines*, should the Temple be despis'd, or its *Magnificence* destroy'd, Persecute St. Paul, or like *Demas* Forsake him? Such Men follow Christ for his *Loaves*, and not for his *Doctrine*: And the same Supposition will be found to have the same Consequence in all lesser Instances.

P. 19. Our Author proceeds to tell us, that *It is the Prerogative of God alone, to know and judge the Hearts of the Dissenters, whether they have taken due care to inform themselves, or whether they sincerely profess what they believe; and that supposing them to be in the wrong, they have yet an unquestionable Right to Toleration*, the Nature and Extent of which he afterwards describes. I hope what I have already said, and shall further offer, will convince my Reader, that the Reasons for their Separation, and *Occasional Conformity*, are altogether Insufficient; that considering under what Advantages of Information they have liv'd from their Infancy, those among 'em who are really Mistaken, have not us'd due Impartiality and Diligence in their Enquiries after Truth; that the Inconsistency in their Practice shews their Disobedience to our Laws, to proceed not from the *Weakness of their Judgment*, but the *Perverseness of their Will*, and therefore excludes 'em from all Pleas of Impunity, with which Error and Sincerity can supply Offenders. Therefore it can be no Breach of Charity in that Accomplish'd Gentleman, Sir *Humphry Mackworth*, or any other sensible Person, to Charge them with *Hypocrisy*, whose open and undeniable *Actions* are so Repugnant to their profess'd *Opinions*, as to leave not the least ground to believe them H O N E S T. If these wilful Errors must be extenuated with the Title of a *Weakness in Judgment*, I hope the Dissenters themselves will at least own this, That it shews how *Unfit* Persons they are to fill and discharge those Places and Offices they pretend to have a *Right* to, upon no other Qualification than that of their *Ignorance*: Doubtless such Men are admirably capacitated to Rule, and Prescribe Laws, which they own they cannot Understand, and to which they cou'd never themselves pay Obedience, or be restrain'd by their Power. And if they  
are



are to be Toleraed for no other Reason, but because they are *Peaceable Men*, I fear they will be under no less a Difficulty to make out their Claim to this Reason, since their *Mistakes* (as they slightly term their Rebellious Obstinacy) have been found as Fatal and Pernicious to the *Peace* and *Security* of the Kingdom, as they have been Re-proachful to themselves. But we come now to examine those Arguments on which they wou'd found this Toleration. As for our Author's Description of a *Perfect Unlimited Toleration*, it is in the main True and Just: Toleration in its general Notion implying, a *suffering any Thing to be done without Punishments*; a *complete and absolute Toleration of those Members of any Nation, who are mistaken in Matters of Religion*, is (as he says) an *Exemption of them from all Civil Penalties upon that Account*. And such a Toleration of our Protestant Dissenters in particular, is, *Securing them from all Harm and Loss which our Laws protect INNOCENT Men from*. The *Act of Toleration* therefore does allow the Dissenters in the Exercise of their Religion, and the Enjoyment of their Lives and Fortunes, but the Legislators cannot be thought by *That Act*, so to have Tyed up their own Hands, as for ever to have disabled themselves, by any *subsequent Law*, from restraining the intrenching Abuse of that Toleration, to the Prejudice of those that granted it. Nor can it be suppos'd, that this *Act of Toleration* should entitle the Dissenters to all the Privileges those enjoy, who obey the *Act of Uniformity*; or, that the excluding the Dissenters from those Privileges, is a Penalty, or Inconsistent with their Liberty of Choosing and Professing their own Religion. Doubtless Prejudice and Interest can never so much Blind and Infatuate these Men, as to render 'em incapable of seeing the vast Difference betwixt *Protection* and *Privilege*, *Impunity* and *Reward*: Certainly a Man may enjoy *Liberty* and *Property*, and all that a *Good and Innocent Citizen* is entitled to, tho' he be not Advanc'd or Preferr'd by the *Publick Favour*, the want of which can no ways hinder him from the Profession of his Religion. But we shall proceed to examine further those Arguments, upon which the Dissenters found their *Right* to this *Universal Unlimited Toleration*; and shall prove, that such an *Unbounded Exemption* from all *Coercive Penalties* whatsoever, as they Demand, can't be *Due* to them in strict *Justice*, but must be a meer *Act of Grace* and *Favour*: That however, to debar them from Publick Employments wou'd be no Breach of their *Toleration*, and that the Learned *Sir Humphry Mackworth* (to whom the Highest Returns of Gratitude are Owing, from all True Friends of the *Church and State*, for his signal Service to Both) has Defended this Cause with the greatest Strength of Reason, and without the least Self-Contradiction here charg'd upon him, by the most scandalous Instance of it in the World, our Fallacious, Ignorant and Self-betraying Scribler.

P. 23. §. I. The First Proposition here laid down is, *That a Toleration is the indefeasable Right of all Mankind, and particularly the Dissenters; for these Reasons, because no Man can H E L P believing what he T H I N K S is true, and every Man is bound to worship God in that way, which he T H I N K S is best, and that no Man should be punish'd for that*

## The Rights of the Church of England.

that which he can't or ought not to help. Here I desire the Reader to observe that this Argument, if Conclusive, will serve to prove an *Equal Right* of Toleration to all SECTS OF INFIDELS and PAPISTS, in their Prophane and Superstitious Opinions, which the Dissenters will hardly grant to the *Latter*, whatever they will do to the *Former*. But have *Hereticks* a RIGHT publickly to Profess and Propagate their Heresies? *St. Paul*, who deliver'd some of them over to *Satan*, did not it seems understand this *indefeasible Right*, that every Man has of Thinking, Talking, and Acting as he pleases: And our Legislators, both *Ecclasiastical* and *Civil*, have entrench'd upon the Liberty of Mankind, in presuming to lay any Restraint on this Universal Freedom: The Statute *de Hæretico comburendo* was forsooth much fitter for the *Flames*, than those *Martyrs* to *Villany* which it condemn'd. According to this Notion, the whole Revelation of God must be entirely subject to Humane Will, and the *Jews* had doubtless a RIGHT to commit Idolatry, and to crucify our Blessed Lord and Saviour, because these execrable Crimes were perhaps agreeable to their own Perswasions, and they were so grossly wicked and stupid as to THINK they did God good Service by them. But will the Dissenters so far imitate their absurd Example and Tenents, as to deny this manifest Truth, That Our Opinions are so far in our Power, as to Entitle us to Rewards and Punishments? The *Mosaick Law* threatn'd Temporal Death to the Disbelief of God's Unity and Providence, and the *Gospel* as expressly denounces *Eternal*, to such as reject and desert their Faith. Both therefore by supposing Men's Opinions to be *Criminal*, imply, that they are *Voluntary*. Whosoever thinks otherwise, must deny the Sincerity of that Exhortation of *St. Paul* to the *Corinthians*, 1 Ep. c. i. v. 10. *I beseech you Brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, that there be no Divisions among you, but that you be perfectly join'd together in the same Judgment.* Which solemn Words of the Apostle can signify nothing, unless we allow, that when Men are of opposite Perswasions, and divide from the Church, those who are in the Wrong, are not only at Liberty, but are oblig'd to relinquish their Errors, and Embrace the Truth: And consequently 'tis ridiculous Nonsense to say with this Author, That a Man is neither able nor bound to retract his Errors. Indeed the Mind of Man necessarily judges according to the Appearance of Things, but that they shou'd appear in a due and convincing Light, depends upon our Will and Election, because it is in our Power to prosecute or restrain our Enquiries after them, and to divert the Understanding from examining and considering any Truth, which without such a previous Consideration, we cannot assent to. And since, from the Abuse of this Liberty, proceeds all the Variety of Errors which we fall into, we are as justly responsible for these, as the very immediate Acts of our Will. And tho' a Man shou'd be bound to Worship God in that way which he THINKS to be best, yet if his Conscience err in its Information, he is accountable for THINKING that Worship true, which is false, and consequently is liable to a Penalty for it. But this Matter has been in a great Measure stated before.



P. 23. § II. The Proposition, whereby this Author proves a Man's Right to a Toleration, let him *Think* what he will, is, *Because no Man, neither in general, nor the Magistrate in particular, has any Authority, either to oblige another by a Law to believe any Speculative Article; or to a prove of any Mode of Worship, or else to undergo a Penalty. The Magistrate (he says) has no such Authority, because his Province extends no farther than the Lives, Liberties, and Properties of the Subject, but can't reach to any Points of Faith or Worship, which being not the Ends of Civil Society can't be the Matter of the Enacting Part of any Law.* But can this Author be either so confident or ignorant to assert, that this is not a quite different Representation of the End and Extent of the Magistrate's Power, from what *St. Paul* and *St. Peter* have given us of it? The *First*, whereof in the 13<sup>th</sup>, of his Epistle to the *Romans*, terms the *Magistrate* the *Minister of God, and an Avenger to execute wrath on them that do Evil.* v. 4. And the *Second* places the Exercise of his Authority in the *Punishment of Evil Doers, and the Praise of them that do well.* 1 Ep. 2. 14. Whereas, in this Writer's Opinion, the Magistrate's Commission only warrants him to *Protect the Lives, and promote the Civil Interests* of the People, but not to intermeddle in their *Religious Concerns*, not to *Execute Wrath upon Evil Doers as such*, unless their Impieties accidentally interfere with the Temporal Advantages of the Community. This Advocate of the Fanaticks has forgot the Power, the *Lay-Elders* formerly claim'd and exercis'd among the *Presbyterians*, who were invested with a mixt sort of *Secular*, as well as *Ecclesiastical* Jurisdiction, and had the Authority of Compulsion and Penalty lodg'd in their Hands: And that their Brethren, now in *Scotland*, put it in such rigorous Execution, that it is there no less than Forfeiture of Goods and Estate, to believe or profess any Doctrines contrary to those establish'd. But however, suppose we should allow our Author, what he so absurdly asserts, that *The Sole End of Government is to protect the Lives, Liberties and Properties of the Subject*, does not the Belief and Practice of Religion, in their own Nature and proper Effects, tend to promote the *publick Good*, and has not God assign'd the benign and vindictive Dispensations of his Providence, to the Increase and Decay of Piety in any Nation? Is not this the plain and express Tenour of the whole *Legal* as well as *Evangelical* Oeconomy? Is not this the great Covenant of God with Mankind, declar'd as well by *Moses* as *Christ*, and all the Prophets since the World began? And have not we found their Veracity fulfill'd in a visible Demonstration, that *Righteousness exalteth a Nation, and Sin is the Reproach of any People*? Certainly the Magistrate's Commission, which requires him to provide for, and secure the Temporal Interest of the Community, does by Consequence oblige him, as he is God's Vice-Gerent, to preserve and propagate the true Faith and Worship. As for the *Church's Legislative Power and Authority to inflict Penalties*, which this Author denies, if by Penalty he understands a *Civil Sanction*, we freely grant, that the Authority of the Church, when not assisted and seconded by that of the Magistrate, does not, by it self, extend to the Inflicting any such Penalty. The Power of the Church is always the same, whether it be under a State of Per-

cution, Toleration, or Establishment: And, in both the former Conditions, Obedience is only due to it under the Pain of *Ecclesiastical Censures*, and the Consequence annex'to 'em, of incurring God's Infinite Displeasure: A Sanction, one wou'd think, in it self sufficient, to need no additional Civil Penalty to enforce it. As for the Church's having any *Power to make any new Article of Faith*, our own Church having in her XX *Article*, so expressly disown'd it, this Writer is very unseasonably impertinent, in endeavouring to prove the Illegality of any such Imposition. However, she might think her self invested with such an Authority, were there no better Argument against the Exercise of it, than what our trifling Author produces, which is this Magisterial Assertion, That *the Church has no Legislative Power, and is restrain'd barely to the Execution of those Laws which our Saviour has left us*. A Position utterly inconsistent with that Command of the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrs.*, *Obey those who have the Rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your Souls.* C. 13. v. 17: And with the whole Conduct of the Council of *Jerusalem*, as it stands recorded in the 15th of the *Acts*: In which the *Apostles* and *Elders* gave the highest Proof of a *Legislative Power* residing in the Church, and extending to what our Saviour never prohibited or enjoin'd. The Execution of this Power is sometimes render'd more easy, by the Assistance of Civil Governours, when, according to their Duty, they encourage and support the Church in her Authority, sometimes more difficult, by their Opposition, when *the Kings of the Earth stand up, and the Rulers take Counsel together, against the Lord and his Messiah, whom they ought to kiss and reverence, lest he be angry, and they perish from the right way.* Ps. 1. 2. Thus as the Church may Enact Laws for Decency and good Order, the State is oblig'd to inflict those Penalties by additional Laws, that are most likely to enforce them. And this Doctrine is perfectly agreeable to the Constitution of our own Kingdom, in which *Her Majesty* enjoys both Powers United, and is *Supream in all Causes, Ecclesiastical and Civil*. Which, methinks, our Author might have remember'd that he had granted in his Dedication to the Queen tho' he expressly denies it here: But defending the Principles of the *Occasional Conformist*, he cou'd not forbear imitating his Example.

P. 19.

P. 24. §. III, The Third Reason for an *Absolute Toleration* of all *Religious Sects*, is drawn from the Nature of Penalties, as being wholly *Ineffectual* to convince the Mind, that any *Article of Faith* is true, or manner of Worship best, serving only to restrain and deter, not to persuade or convince. It must indeed be acknowledg'd, that Penalties annex'd to the Disbelief of any Doctrine, are no Proof of its Truth: But however, they may be, doubtless, very instrumental in gaining our Assent to it. Thus the Improvement of Youth in Arts and Sciences generally depends upon the Strictness and Severity of their Instructors, tho' no Man ever pretended to believe the Truth and Certainty of what is learnt, deducible from it. Is not that tremendous Threat of our blessed Saviour, upon which is laid no less than the whole Support of the Christian Faith, *He that Believeth not shall be Damn'd*, a most undeniable Instance of the proper Use and Efficacy of Penalties, to convince the



the World, and influence their Belief? Which could never attain the end for which it was denunc'd did not the dread of Punishment dispose Men for Conviction, and controul their Belief as well as Practice. From whence it appears, that tho' Punishments are no *Proper Mediums* to prove the Truth of any Doctrine, yet both God and Man have made choice of 'em, as very powerful Means to contribute to our Belief of it, by constraining us to apply our selves to the most effectual Helps and Methods of knowing it. But our Author, with as much *Viras Philosophy*, still urges, That *Nothing but a Connection between Ideas, and the Evidence of that Connection can convince: and there being no Connection between the Truth of any Proposition and a Penalty, it is impossible by Penalties to work any Conviction.* If this Sceptical Writer had liv'd in the time of our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles, when the Gospel was first promulg'd, upon this Principle he might as well have argued himself into a Disbelief of its Doctrines, as now he defends his Disobedience to the Discipline of the Church by it. For when he had heard the Articles of Faith propos'd, as a Means of Salvation, he might have disputed the Want of *Connection* between the *Ideas* of Faith and Reward, of Infidelity and Damnation. There are many sublime Mysteries in Christianity, which are never to be comprehended or explain'd, by *Connection of Ideas*, as that of the Trinity, the Incarnation of the Son of God, and the like: Yet we are oblig'd to believe 'em, on no less a *Penalty* than the Loss of Eternal Life. Not only all *Divine Laws*, under the *Mosaick* as well as *Christian Dispensation*, but all Human Laws also must be enforc'd by *Penalties*, yet is it the Legislator's Business to convince any private Man of the Reason of those Laws? Is every Peasant to dispute his Submission to the *Parliamentary Acts and Statutes*, because he can't apprehend the Ground of every Proposition contain'd in them, or has not a *Connection between the Ideas* of *Thevery, Murther, a Whipping-Post, and a Gallows*? So that this kind of *Antinomian* Writer wou'd entirely bereave all Laws of their Force and Power by depriving them of their Sanctions. Let us here, without any Breach of Charity, judge whither these Men's Principles lead 'em, and in what they will end: Is it not in *Anarchy* as well as *Atheism*, in the utter Subversion of all Religion as well as Government, and the Abrogation of all the Laws of God, as well as Man? If this impious and sturdy Scribler in his Minority had bin a little more subject to Penalties, and had underwent the Discipline of that *Cat-of-Nine-Tails* he mentions, and has so well deserv'd for his rebellious Position, it wou'd have strangely *Enlighten'd* his Understanding (as he expresses it) and have prevented all those dark Reasonings he so blindly urges, and which, to speak the Truth, a *Corporal Correction* is the best Answer to.

P. 24. §. IV. His next Argument, against Penalties in Religion, is founded upon this supposition, *That an Authority to inflict them would not be Useful to Mankind, because that Men, not being Infallible, may by the exercise of that Power, propagate Error as well as Truth: that this is very likely to happen, because more Churches and Magistrates are in the Wrong than the Right, and that Truth and Error can never be Propagated by the same Means; and lastly, that every Man must judge freely of Truth for himself, and no Man shou'd judge for Another.* This way of Arguing plainly

supposes, that no Man, who is not Infallible, can be secure that his Opinion about Religious Matters is True; and tends to introduce an Universal Scepticism into Mens Minds, and concludes as strongly against the Method of Recommending our Faith by Reason and Argument, as Propagating it by Authority: Since those who pursue the former Method, are not Infallible, and therefore, according to our Author, can't be secure, that they don't propagate Error instead of Truth. The Authority about which we Dispute, is a Power of enforcing the Belief and Practice of the True Religion by Penalties, which Power is not the less conducive to that end, because so *Great a Majority of Churches and Magistrates are in the Wrong*. There was a Time when the True Religion was Profess'd but in One Nation of the World, in which however, Idolatry (the Religion of all Mankind besides) was by Divine Appointment Punish'd with the utmost Severity; Which irrefragably proves, that Penalties may be useful to restrain the Belief and Practice of a False Religion, notwithstanding the greatest Disproportion betwixt those who Believe, and those who Reject the Truth. And nothing is more usual than the same thing differently apply'd, that may be instrumental in Propagating both Error and Truth. The *Devil* we know had his *Oracles* and *Inspirations* in Imitation of *GOD's Prophets* and *Apostles*. It cannot be deny'd, but that the *Art of Rhetorick* may be abus'd, to recommend and set off Falsehood, and yet our Author's Dedication to Her Majesty (which so vainly abounds with all the Affectation of it) is pretend'd to be written in favour of the Truth, to prevent those Representations of the Dissenters Disloyalty, which had been so undeniably prov'd in another Dedication to the Queen. A convincing Proof, that Truth may be maintain'd, and Error insinuated by the same Means. If therefore the fear of Punishment can *Reconcile Men to Popish Tenets*, the worst of Errors, in defiance of the most cogent Arguments (as our Author says) may we not suppose, that when this Fear is seconded by cogent Arguments, it would most effectually recommend the Truth to their Assent? To give Success to our Enquiries after it, a free and impartial use of our Reason, without an absolute Resignation of it to the Judgment of others, is necessary. But however, this does not infer, that the fear of Punishment is not as necessary to prevent, or rescue Men out of, Error: Since that most efficaciously incites them to exert the utmost of their Power, which so great a Difficulty will require as *the Renouncing our Prejudices*, and to lay aside that partial Deference we are so apt to give to other Men's Judgments. However, a private Man ought to be very confident of the Truth of his Reasons, that shall presume to set them up in Opposition, either to the united Opinion of the Catholick Church, or the general Tenets of his own particular Church. We ought not indeed *implicitly* to subscribe to Articles we cannot believe, but in Matters of Doubt and Difficulty, wherein any One can't be suppos'd to be an absolute and compleat Judge, he is oblig'd to submit himself to the better Determination of Men of more Learning and Abilities, rather than maintain a *Singular* Opinion, which he is not positively assur'd of. For if every Man may be allow'd to set up an *Unlimited Freedom* of Thinking in Religion, as he pleases, according to his  
irregular



irregular Humour or Caprice, we should have as many different Religions, as there are Men in the World. Tho' the Gospel gain'd Admission into Men's Understanding, by an impartial Search of the Scriptures and Examination of the Apostle's Doctrine, yet St. Paul, by whose Ministry it was so much propagated, and who, if ever any Man, deserv'd the glorious Character of a *Votary to Truth, and a Witness of it to others*, thought Punishment so proper a Restraint of Infidelity, *1 Tim. i.* that for it, *he deliver'd Hymeneus and Philetus over to Satan*, which way of Excommunication was attended, in the Primitive Church, with the greatest Plagues that the Devil cou'd inflict both upon Soul and Body.

P. 25. §. V. Our Author's Reasons for a Toleration in the Essentials of Religion being Disprov'd, let us see next how he pretends to invalidate the Authority of the Church, and Magistrate, in prescribing Circumstantial, which he denies, as being *Things altogether in their Nature Indifferent*, and that *Indifferent things can't be the Obj<sup>t</sup> of a Law*. To wick we Answer, that Things are Indifferent, either with respect to *their End*, or the *Command* of Superiors. The Injunctions of the Church, with respect to their *End*, can never be thought to be laid upon Trifles and Impertinencies wholly useless, but are prescrib'd for Decency and Order, which must be allow'd to be Matter of very high Importance and Advantage. And when they are once Commanded, they cease to be Indifferent in their use, but lay an Obligation of Obedience under the Penalty due to Sin. The very Power to propagate the true Faith and Worship, must of necessity infer a Right to prescribe these Indifferent Things. As for Instance, to Command in what Place, at what Time, and in what Manner such Faith is to be publicly profess'd, and such Worship perform'd, God having left these Circumstances undetermin'd: and because the aforementioned Power can't be executed whilst they continue so, they necessarily fall under the Determination of those who are invested with it. There can't be conceived a more rash and ill grounded Inference than this of our Author's, *That because the Advantage of Society is the End and Measure of Laws, therefore Indifferent Things ought not to be the Matter of Laws*. Suppose several Means are equally conducive to the same End, and each consequently Indifferent with respect to it, are therefore none to be prescrib'd by those to whom the prosecution of that End is committed? To use our Author's Instance The Physicians may have several Remedies for Phrenzy, as Blood-letting, Hellebore, dark Room, &c. wherein the Madman may be perhaps confin'd to his Straw, and ty'd up from some certain sorts of Meats and Drinks, whereby the Doctor renders himself intolerable to his Patient, P. 16. who with our Author, under these Circumstances, may sue for a Toleration: However, he can't deny, but that the Physician may justly refuse it, and use any of these Remedies to cure such Enthusiasts. But to leave this Trifler with his Chips in Porridge, under a Course with his Doctor, which indeed he seems to want; Laws are not made to restrain Men only from Hurtful, but also to enjoin Useful Actions; and this End is fully answer'd, when the Legillator, out of the great Variety of Means that offer themselves to his Choice, as subservient to the Publick Good, selects such as are sufficient for that Purpose, tho' in Preference to others

others, equally so. It is the Duty of the Magistrates to make, not only *Just*, but *Good* Laws, not only such as may be *innocently* obcy'd, but likewise such as will tend in their Execution to the *General Good and Advantage* of the People, tho' not agreeable to the particular *Humours* of every *Private Man*: We must distinguish betwixt the *Bounds* which the Magistrate is to observe in *Making Laws*, and the *Measures* of his *Subject's Obedience*: Tho' the *Inexpedience* of any thing ought to debar him from enjoining it, yet when 'tis *Enacted*, nothing but the *Illegality* of it, can release them from its Observation. When the Law is actually promulg'd, shall the *Multitude* be permitted to question, and arraign the *Prudence* and *Discretion* of their *Legislators*? It is the greatest *Inconvenience*, in a *State of Nature*, that Men's *Actions* being therein directed by their *Private Judgments*, and those various, as their *Humours*, no unanimous *Endeavour* can be expected amongst 'em to repel a *Common Enemy*, or provide for their *mutal Security*. And this *Misfortune* must equally attend a *State of Society and Government*, if every *Subject* therein, may be allow'd to refuse to act in *Conjunction* with the rest, whenever his *Opinion* happens to differ from the *Legislator's*, concerning the *Expedience* of a *Law*. The *Consequences* of such a wild *Liberty* as this, wou'd be more grievous and intolerable, than all the most *Unnecessary* *Commands* of the most *Humourfome Prince* in the *World*. It wou'd in short overturn any *Constitution*, and subvert the very *Being* of *Government*. For, What was the *Rise* of that *Damnable and never to be forgotten Rebellion* in 41. but the *admir'd Maxim* of our *Seditious Pamphleteer*, here insolently asserted, That *Obedience is only due to the Magistrate, when the People think he commands Justa & Utilia*? The *Miseries* whereof, which he has cursorily term'd *Extravagancies* in his *Dedication* to the *Queen*, I hope our *Author* will allow at least to be something worse than the *Freaks of Heliogabalus*; and that *Edict of the Emperor*, that ordered all the *Spider-webs* in *Rome* to be collected, and the *People* to be entertain'd with a *Show of Mice, Rats, Weasels, and Pole-cats*, was not more ridiculous than the awkward *Gesticulation*, *Phantastical Whining*, and *Hypocritical Canting* of those *Rebellious Saints*, who made *Religion* vile and contemptible, by covering all their *villanous Impieties* under a *Godly Masquerade*. But this *Author's* whole *Book* is one entire *Confutation* of this his *Beloved Maxim*, That *the Magistrate has an undoubted Right to command Omnia Justa & Utilia*, having, thro' the whole *Course* of it asserted, That every *Man* has an *un-doubted Right to Think, Believe, and Act as he Pleases*.

P. 14.

P. 26.

P. 27. §. I. Our weak *Author* having in his own vain *Imagination* Triumph'd o're the *Cause* of the *Church*, in maintaining an *UNIVERSAL Toleration* of all *SECTS* and *INFIDELS* whatsoever, proceeds with all the *Little Force* he can *Muster*, to *Attack* that *Honourable Member*, *Sir H. Ashmole*, who has so *eminently Signaliz'd* himself in this *Controversy*; and represents him under the odious *Character* of a *Persecutor*, both in his *Opinions* and *Practice*. The first *Reason* he produces, to ground this *Accusation* upon, is this *Worthy Gentleman's* supposing *Occasional Conformists* to be *Hypocrites*, in that they pretend *Conscience*, and pursue, nothing but their *Advantage*. The *Truth* of which, we have already in some measure prov'd, and we hope to make undeniably appear in

in



in the Sequel of this Discourse. That this is granted by Many of the Dissenters themselves, admits of no dispute, and therefore so just and Accurate a Writer, as Sir H. M. may be suppos'd to Assert, not for any *Quaintness of Expression*, but his undoubted Assurance of the Fact, that *Occasional Conformists, who desire the Guardianship and Execution of our Laws, are seldom intrusted by Dissenters to be Guardians of their Children, and Executors of their Wills.* Which Fact our Author has insinuated to be of so fatal a Consequence, that he says Sir H. M. does by asserting it, as far as in him lies, endeavour to take away the Liberty from Honest Men of following their respective Trades, which he himself makes one Instance of Toleration: Since he that is not fit to be Trusted as an Executor, is as unfit to be Dealt with as a Merchant. This Consequence is as false, as 'tis popular: For I may Trade with a Quaker, Papist, Presbyterian, or Atheist, or any Man without regard had to his Religion; but there's very good Reason to make no such Man my Executor, for that is a Charge of the Highest Trust: Whilst I deal with such my self, I can prevent their Villany, or at least the Inconvenience will affect only my own Person, but the other Case Hazards the Safety of my Family. I shall add, that if Sir. Humphrey Mackworth's Censure of the Occasional Conformist be a Persecution, both our Houses of Parliament are Chargeable with it, and equally partake in its Guilt. For to that Argument produced by the Commons, That the Intent of the Occasional Bill was to prevent a scandalous Practice, which is a Reproach to all Religion, gives Offence to all Christians, and to the best among the Dissenters themselves, the Lords replied, That they had gone a great way to prevent the EVIL that Bill was intended to remedy, and that it was a Scandal to Religion that Persons should Conform only for a Place (\*) Thus Sir Humphrey Mackworth's Practice is fully vindicated, by the great Precedents he is able to quote for it; and the Consistency of his Assertion with his Notion of the Toleration, due to Conscientious Dissenters, will as clearly appear, if we consider these Six following Positions, and how very reconcileable the greatest Tenderness for Dissenters is, with them.

P. 29. §. II. The Positions are these, 1. That tho' a Toleration ought to be given to a constant Dissenter, it ought not to be given to an Occasional Conformist. 2. That to incapacitate an Occasional Conformist for all Places and Employments, is not inconsistent with a Toleration. 3. That Penalties are not an improper Method to convince. 4. Or at least to dispose Men's Minds for Conviction. 5. That the Dissenters are not capable of Employments by the Act of Toleration, Or, 6<sup>ly</sup>, That if they are capable by that Law or any other, they should not be suffer'd to remain so,

P. 29. §. I. First, That tho' a Toleration ought to be given to a Constant Dissenter, it ought not to be given to an Occasional Conformist. Sir. H. M. indeed very truly accounts these more Inexcusable than Constant Dissenters, and that those who Uniformly follow the Prejudices of their Education, in an uninterrupted Separation from our Church, are more justly entitl'd to Impunity, than such Separatists who can Com-

(\*) Reports of several Conferences relating to an Act to prevent Occasional Conformity, p. 21. 25.

municate with her, when 'tis the condition of obtaining some Temporal Honour or Advantage. For which Reason his excellent Distinction betwixt a *Conscientious Dissenter*, and a *State Dissenter*, or an Occasional Conformist for a Place, is just, and well grounded. And should a Man think, that no other means ought to be us'd to Reclaim the former, but Love and Kindness, Arguments, Persuasions, and a good Example, this would not oblige him to allow that such gentle Treatment was due to the latter. How far Men's Opinions are in their own Power, how justly their Religious Errors expose 'em to, and how effectually they may be remov'd by, Penalties, we have before examin'd, and there shewn, how little Reason our Author has to insist, as he here does, upon his Arguments for a Toleration of *Atheists*, *Deists*, *Secinians*, and all other Sects in the World, as if they were obvious and undeniable Truths. Because an *Occasional Conformist* has not the same Notion of our Church, and the terms of her Communion, as a *Constant Separatist*; therefore his Non conformity is more Inexcusable; the Guilt of his Schism is aggravated by his favourable Opinion of that Church he Dissents from; this makes all Arguments for Separation from it, which are at best Insufficient, to become in his Mouth, trifling and frivolous. Our Author says, that to make *Conscientious Dissenters* the Object of Toleration, is to subvert all Toleration: since no Magistrate can tell, who is a *Conscientious Dissenter*, and who is not: Whereas there can't be any more sure and infallible *Criteria* of any thing than of this: For what can be a greater Demonstration, than such *Irreconcilable Contradictions* betwixt Men's Profession and Practice, as may enable the Magistrate, or any other to make the Discovery? For Instance, should a Man join sometimes in the most solemn Profession of our Creeds, and yet separate from the Church, because the Fancies and Interests of Men have introduc'd Corruptions into 'em; Should the same Man think the Worship he owes to God, to be what he judges most Acceptable to him, and yet sometimes comply with a way of Worship, which he esteems not to be so, that Man must either want sound Understanding, so as not to be able to see the most open and palpable Contradictions, or be conscious of the grossest Inconsistency, betwixt his Principles and Actions. And because *Occasional Conformists* are, even according to our Author's Principles, Chargeable with Hypocrisy upon both these accounts, he must own, that no one can want sufficient Demonstration, that they neither are, or can be *Conscientious Dissenters*. But the Dissenters, who before made their Conscience the only Plea for their Toleration, now urge, that If the Magistrate Tolerates only *Conscientious Dissenters*, it would not only Cramp a Toleration, but render it Impracticable. But we can't dismiss this part of our Author's Performance, without considering a very remarkable Inference, which he draws from Sir H. Maitworth's Treatise on the Bill. He says, this Gentleman has given Reason to SUSPECT, than he thinks not more Favourably of any other Dissenters, than of Occasional Conformists; and SEEMS to suppose, that 'tis their stubborn and corrupt Wills that makes 'em Dissent. To shew the Sincerity of this Quotation I shall transcribe Sir Humphrey's Words at full length, which are these:

P. 23.

P. 6.



P. 6. §. 2. *When Men ought, nay can, and actually do comply with the Law for their own private Advantage, but will not for the sake of the Government, which is the Case of Occasional Conformists, Whether is it the Law, or their own stubborn and corrupt Will, that puts 'em under an Incapacity of serving their Prince and Country?* In which Passage there occur such Expressions as exclude all Possibility of its being design'd against Constant Dissenters, that our Author's imperfect Recital, and unfair Misapplication of it to them, may pass for the greatest Instance of Hypocrisy, next to that Practice, for which he appears in this Book, a Senseless and Ridiculous Advocate.

P. 34. §. 2. But to involve Sir *Humphry Mackworth* under the same Crime, (that is here alleg'd against himself) of Hypocrisy, in maintaining Contradiction, he is endeavouring to retort this Argument upon him, by fast'ning an Inconsistency upon him, how truly we shall see in the Examination of the next Proposition ascrib'd to him, namely, *That to Incapacitate Occasional Conformists, for all Places and Employments, is not Inconsistent with a Toleration.* Now as all Offices of State and Government are Trusts of Power, they must be granted from those in whom that Power is lodg'd, as Matters of Free Gift, to which no one Person can lay any Claim; whether they are deriv'd from the Sovereign, or his immediate Representatives constituted by Nomination, or whether they are settled by the Determination and Appointment of the Legislature. And as they are purely the Effects of Bounty and Favour, those that give 'em have an undoubted Right to Assign the Qualifications of such as shall Enjoy them: Whereby if any Number of Men shall be debarr'd from them, they can't on that account be thought to undergo any Punishment or Penalty. For whereas this in its Notion carries a necessary Reference to some antecedent Crime, of which when justly inflicted, it argues the suffering Party to be Guilty; on the contrary, the most Inoffensive Man Living, may be fairly excluded from Civil Employments. To justify this, it's sufficient that he wants some Accomplishments to Qualify him for that Post, or Business, that a Man may be Innocently without, or that others may be possess'd of in an higher degree. Neither is hereby any Mark of Infamy or Disgrace put upon them, the Preference in this case given to others, at most, is only an Argument, that their Governours think them not the MOST FIT among the Body of Subjects for Offices of State, an Opinion that every Modest Man (except an Occasional Conformist) must entertain of himself. Nay, in some Cases the Legislature may Incapacitate some Members of the Common-wealth to hold publick Employments, tho' in their Judgment no ways Inferior to those to whom they are Appropriated. When a Kingdom is divided into opposite Factions, Disaffected to each other by long Hereditary Quarrels, and Distracted in Opinion, concerning the true Interest of their Country, and the best Means of advancing it: If in this Case the Legislators desire Unanimity in the Publick Proceedings, (without which no Nation can be safe or happy) they must exclude One Party or Other from a Share in the Administration, notwithstanding the Equal Opinion they may have of their Abilities.

E

And

And that our *Protestant Dissenters* may be thus excluded *without any Breach of the Toleration* which they claim, appears from our Author's Description of it *Pag. 20. §. II.* which as he defines to *Be an Exemption of them from any Harm the Law protects every innocent English-Man from, and securing them in those Rights which innocent Men enjoy,* certainly disabling them to hold Publick Places and Employments is *consistent* with it. Forasmuch as many *Innocent Subjects of England* are under that Incapacity. For is not one whole Sex debarr'd from publick Employments, notwithstanding its great *Capacity* for Business and Government? Which our Constitution it self supposes, by *Allowing the very Crown to descend upon it, and the Throne has been fill'd by it in the Two most Incomparably Glorious and Prosperous Reigns since the Conquest.* A manifest Proof how poor a Claim *Innocence* and even *Ability* give to *Places of Trust and Honour;* to which no Man can *assume any Right,* as being meerly Acts of *Grace,* and what *Merit* the *Occasional Conformists* can pretend to, must be left in the *Donor's Breast* to judge. We may justly fear that trusting Men of such Hypocritical and pernicious Principles and Practices will be found a ready Way to *bury the QUEEN, instead of them, alive,* who can have the Confidence to menace the Government with their hard Usage, and Rebeliously here assert, that they are stigmatiz'd as *Pillory'd and Expos'd Villains not fit to be trusted;* and that they are *Murder'd* if they are not *Prefer'd.* As for the *Purchas'd Employments,* which our Author has the Modesty to term *Free-Holds and Properties,* if the Government shou'd re-assume them by any Law, it is but *Justice* upon that base Corruption, by which they were at first *unrighteously obtain'd:* this indeed wou'd be only restoring things, out of *Usurpation,* to their proper and primitive Order, and putting them in the Channel which they ought to run in. And if such *Mercenary Stock Jolbers of Offices,* shou'd be *Stript and starv'd,* it is only what they deserve, for bringing such a *Disgrace* upon the Government, by making a meer Traffick and Exchange of it. Since therefore the *Incapacity* intended by the Bill is *no Encroachment upon the Liberty, Property and Rights of the Subject,* since, (as Sir *H. Mackworth* says) it *only aims at the PRESERVATION OF THE GOVERNMENT,* not the *Persecution of Dissenters,* and affects none who think fit to *Conform Occasionally for their own private Information,* since in those who *Occasionally Conform, on other Accounts,* it does not so much regard the *Nature of their crime,* as the **PUBLICK SAFETY,** we may very justly conclude that Sir *Humphry's* Learned Defence of the Occasional Bill is altogether consistent with his *Notions of Toleration,* and cannot, without the most malicious *Mis-Construction,* be any ways term'd a *Persecution.* But this is the old *Cant* of the *Schismatics,* and had *Lewis XIV.* put no severer a *Persecution* on his *Subjects,* the *Hugonots* wou'd have found little Reason to have deserted their Country for want of Employments, or complain'd of the *Tyrannical Usage* of their Sovereign, for not advancing 'em into *Preferments.* They wou'd have been content to have enjoy'd the Exercise of their Religion in Peace and Tranquillity, and wou'd have been so far from ambitiously aspiring to the *Favours* of the Government, that they wou'd have taken it as the utmost

Favour



*Favour* to live undisturb'd in their Rights and Properties, and the Profession of their own particular Sentiments. But this will not satisfy *Our English Dissenters*, who must have their Religion sit *Confortable* about them, not *bare* and *naked*, but well *cloath'd*, and recommended with *Wealth* and *Honour*; they tell us, *they wou'd have their Passage to Heaven thro' this World free and easy*, not molested with the burdensome Doctrines of Mortification and Self-Denial, which are the *Persecuting* Parts of Christianity, and by no means suited to the *Tender* Constitutions of *Saints*, and *Weak Brethren*. They desire to be excus'd the Transportation of *Elijah*, or making an odd Figure in *Foxe's Martyrology*: They protest against *Fire* and *Faggot*, have a *Mortal Aversion* to *Hemp*, and swoon at the Sight of a *Gibbet*, and think nothing so proper a *Vehicle* to the next World, as a *Feather-Bed*: And are therefore very angry with *Sir Humphry Mackworth* for asking the Question, *Whether there are no Hopes of going to a better World without a Publick Employment?* A Question, they tell us, only proper for a *Julian* to put to a *Christian*; but, with Submission, I think it is a Question very properly put from a *Christian* to a *Julian*, to a Man that is no *Christian*, but an *Apostate* and *Renegadoe*, a Man that renounces his own Principles in his Practices.

P. 37. This next Paragraph is so full of Nauseous *Tautology*, and awkward Jest upon *Sir H. M.* that it deserves no other Answer than Contempt and Silence. But lest this Vain-glorious Author shou'd plume himself upon his *Buffoonry*, we will take him a little to Task. The Proposition which herein he ascribes to this Judicious Gentleman, as contradictory to his Notions of Toleration, and the very Premises from whence he deduces it, is, *that Penalties are proper to convince Dissenters*. His Words upon which this Imputation is founded, are these: *That nothing in his Judgment can be more free than the Mind of Man, and nothing can prevail upon it, but what is introduc'd by Love and Kindness, and that therefore he ever thought, that gentle Methods, by Reason, Arguments, and a good Example, were much more proper and likely means to bring the Dissenters over to the Church, than Penalties and Punishments*. Now all that our Author can fairly charge upon *Sir Humphry*, is, that he has not inferr'd quite so much as wou'd have follow'd from his Premises: That he has only gathered from 'em, *That gentle Methods are much more* (instead of the only) *proper Means*, and *much more* (instead of the only) *Likely Means* to bring Dissenters over to the Church, *than Penalties*. Do these Two Propositions, *Gentle Methods can only prevail on the Mind of Man*, and *Gentle Methods are more likely to prevail on it, than Penalties*, contradict each other? The *Latter* asserts nothing but what the *Former* affirms, tho' not exactly so much: And therefore *Novices* in Reasoning know, that the *Former* necessarily contains and infers the *Latter*. The only Fault of such Deductions as this, is, that thy are too manifest, and very seldom inform any One of what they did not know before. But how I pray can it be inferr'd, because *Sir Humphry* declares *Gentle Methods* to be, in his Judgment, *much more likely to win over Dissenters than Penalties*, that he covertly intimates a Desire, that the *Latter* shou'd be inflicted on them? This is so wild a Conjecture, and so groundless an Imputation, as nothing can reconcile, with the great Degree of Charity our Author lays Claim to, but a much greater Want of *Logic*.

Pres. P. 1.  
S&A. 9.

Pr. p. 2.  
Sect. 1.

P. 39. and  
40.

P. 39. The *Fourth* Position which our Author charges upon Sir *H. Mackworth*, as Inconsistent with his Notions of Toleration, is that *Penalties* are (if insufficient to convince the Mind) yet at least proper and effectual to dispose it for Conviction. This our Author infers to be that *Worthy Gentleman's* Opinion, because to all that he says concerning the *Freedom of Mens Minds*, upon which nothing can prevail, but what is introduc'd by Love and Kindness, he subjoins, that He can't conceive that these Means will be render'd less effectual by the Assistance and Influence of the *Occasional Bill*. Now the Incapacity under which that Bill would have laid Dissenters, being the **MILDEST METHOD** by which the Members of the Establish'd Church can attempt their own Security: being, as we have shewn before, neither in Truth, nor in Sir *H. Mackworth's* Opinion, a Punishment, our Author can't infer from what he says concerning the Influence and Assistance of That Bill, that he thinks Penalties proper and effectual to dispose Men for Conviction: But supposing he thought so, let us see how his Adversary proves their Inefficacy to that purpose. He begins thus, *If Deprivations and Incapacities would dispose the Dissenters to be convinc'd, then all the Penal Laws ought to stand in full Force against them: For if Hardships are proper for that end, the greater they are, the more likely they are to be effectual.* One wou'd never have expected to have found an Advocate for the Dissenters drawing this Consequence, and truly they are obliged to us if out of Charity we should Wish it False. For if this Argument proves any thing, it infers, that all Crimes, tho' of the most unequal Demerit, ought to be Punish'd with the same Severity, that is, with the utmost possible. For according to this Reasoning, if any Degree of Punishment be useful to restrain the least Sin, the Punishment due to the greatest, ought to be inflicted on such as are Guilty of it, Because that would more effectually than the other, prevent its Commission.

P. 40. But our Author goes on to this purpose, *If Hardships and Inconveniencies were requisite to dispose Dissenters for Conviction, Cashiering them from their Places wou'd not be necessary for that end; since their Distance from the Church is attended with nothing but Reprach and Difficulty, being already precluded from Usefulness, Honour, and Preferment.* Now how the Dissenters, who in Despight of their Distance from the Church, by *Occasional Conformity* to its Sacraments, daily advance themselves into Places of great Trust and Honour, are at the same time precluded from Honour and Preferment, does, I confess, exceed my Comprehension: This is a more broad and glaring Contradiction than any our Author presumes to charge Sir *H. Mackworth* with. Certainly they who think their Schism attended with nothing but *Hardship* and *Infamy*, whilst they enjoy as well the *Extraordinary Favours* as the common Protection of the Government, contend, as this *Ingenious Senator* says, not for *Liberty of Conscience*, but for *Power and Dominion*, and will never think their Toleration compleat, till they enjoy these exclusively of all their Fellow-Subjects.

P. 3. §. 5. P. 41. Our Author proceeds to ridicule the Way, by which Sir *H. Mackworth* thinks the *Occasional Bill*, which incapacitates Dissenters for Offices, wou'd dispose 'em for Conviction, namely by *Inducing them to Wish for a Reconciliation with the Church, and inclining them to a more favourable*



nable Enquiry into its Nature and Excellency. He thinks nothing more ridiculously absurd, than that Men shou'd be brib'd and intimidated, in order to make 'em judge aright concerning the Excellency of the Establish'd Church, that Truth can be prejudic'd by nothing so much as this Method, nor Falshood supported by anything more. Now after all this insipid Satyr, against disposing Men for Conviction by raising their Hopes and Fears, is it not the very Way that God himself has thought fit to make use of to procure and preserve Men's Belief of the Two only Religions he has reveal'd? To prevent Apostacy from the First, it was made Capital by Moses, and a fearful looking for of Judgment and fiery Indignation was thought necessary, by Christ, to keep us steady and unshaken in the Belief of the Latter. And this, tho' the Law was a Commandment Holy, Just, and Good, and the Gospel yet more agreeable to the best Reason, and wisest Apprehensions of Mankind, is a plain Evidence, that the Excellency of no Church or Religion is so great, but that to perswade Men of it, it may be very proper and effectual to apply to their Passions and alarm their Fears. A Man wou'd be apt to think, that an Author, who rails so plentifully against that Method of gaining Men's Assent which Infinite Wisdom has made use of to propagate and confirm the Belief of Judaism, and Christianity, had no great Reverence for Reveal'd Religion. "Are you sure, Mr. Declaimer (to apply your witty Address to Sir H. Mackworth with some Variation to your self) that there is no Lurking Deist, no Unitarian, no Politico-Theologist, no Socinian, or Spinosan, no Blount or Toland behind the Curtain, who, under Pretence of asserting the Rights of Protestant Dissenters, aims at the Subversion of Christianity, and to reduce this Nation to the Worship of the One True God, as the Cant of some Mahometan Citizens of the World is? A Reformation in the Faith of the Church of England would be very subservient to this blessed End, and make way for Popery, or any thing else, but the true Protestant Religion.

P. 42. Our Author is here, with his usual Fidelity, pleas'd to charge some Propositions on Sir H. M. which he no where so much as Insinuates; As that Occasional Conformity is of great Advantage to the Church, which if he were sure of Sir H. M. Thoughts (which this Writer cou'd not assert, without usurping that Prerogative of God, which he is always charging upon his Adversary) yet both he and all Men must own that constant Conformity must be of Greater Advantage to it: and that it is therefore for its Interest, that Dissenters shou'd have the Inducements to the Latter, which they have now to the Former. Neither does Sir H. Mackworth suppose, as our Author misrepresents him, That Occasional Conformity will be so much practis'd, when 'tis no Inlet into Places, as now it is; On the contrary, he directly asserts, That those great Numbers, who now occasionally conform for their Profit, will then have greater Inducements to be constant to the Church. P. 9. §. 3. This indeed was One Main End, and Design of the Bill it self. Nor Lastly, does he suppose, as this Writer pretends, the Church to be in Danger of any Thing, but her Establishment, should Occasional Communion still continue unrestrain'd, or that the Steadiness of Church-Men to their Principles, and their faithful Adherence to Episcopal Communion, under the greatest Discouragements, is more to be question'd than the Perseverance of the Conscientious Dissenters in the like

like Circumstances. So that all the Inconsistency of Sir H. Mackworth's Opinions, with the Truth, and his own Assertions, is owing to want of Discernment, or a much worse Defect in his Adversary.

P. 43. But he goes on in his usual absurd way of shewing Sir H. Mackworth's Inconsistencies. First roundly and peremptorily asserting, that some Church-men ought to be incapacitated for Places as well as Dissenters, since some MODERATE Men, that pretend to be Members of the Church, have not sufficiently enquir'd into it's Excellency, and that their Conformity is owing to Education, Custom, Ease, and Advantage: and then Arraigning Sir H. Mackworth for want of Charity, in not believing the Dissenters bare Protestations, and for encroaching upon God's Prerogative in judging Mens Hearts, because he passes the like Censure on the Separatists. It is, it seems, our Author's peculiar Way Occasionally to do what he Statedly condemns. He will not, I presume, pretend to judge of Men's Hearts, by Natural Means, with greater Certainty than Sir H. Mackworth, but 'tis the Privilege of SAINTS to be endow'd with Gifts, which none but themselves are conscious of, and who are always conscious of Others, but not of their own Hypocrisy. None but a Sceptick can assert, that after a diligent and impartial Examination of any Truth, a Man can sincerely reject it, as false. And therefore Sir H. Mackworth, with good Reason, affirms, that such an Enquiry into the Doctrine and Constitution of the Establish'd Church must by Consequence, reconcile Dissenters to it: That Uninterrupted Conformity, wou'd be the Effect of that Enquiry, tho' not the same thing with it, as our Author makes Sir H. say, that he may the more effectually blacken him under the odious Character of a Persecutor. Hitherto the Credit of this worthy Gentleman's Accurate Performance (if the Baffling such a Puny Adversary can give any Man any Honour) is advanc'd by the weak Attempts of this, and all that impertinent Fry of Scriblers, who have shewn nothing, besides their own Ignorance and Ill-breeding, but that the most inquisitive Malice can find nothing in Sir H's Treatise that he ought not to maintain, for the sake of the Truth, and his own establish'd Reputation.

P. 44, and 45. The next Absurdity, which our Author without the least Ground, ascribes to that Learned Gentleman, Is this Inference, That Depriving and Incapacitating the Dissenters for Offices, is no Injury to 'em, because they have no Title to, or so much as a Capacity of holding them by the Act of Toleration. Here our Author triumphs, as if Sir H. by this Deduction, had forfeited all Pretences to Sense and Reason, whereas no fair and intelligent Adversary could ever have charg'd him with such a thing. In some Debates, on the Occasional Bill, it was objected, that the Incapacity, under which it put the Dissenters, would entrench upon the Act of Toleration. To which Sir H. replies P. 3. That this Act cou'd be no ways concern'd in a Dispute upon that Subject, there being no Provision made by it, that Dissenters should be initi'd to, or qualify'd for, Publick Offices and Employments. He does not, from these Words, infer, that such an Incapacity wou'd be no possible Injury to Dissenters, but that it was not prejudicial to 'em upon this particular Account, as any ways entrenching upon this Act of Toleration, which cou'd in no Respect be affected by it. Should indeed a Law pass, to Dispose of their Estates, or to burn 'em all



*in the Cheek* (as this Author puts the Case) it would, in Effect, destroy that Act, as inflicting on 'em severer Punishments, than the *Penal Laws* did, from the *Sanction* of which they are exempted by it. But the present Indulgence granted to them, being only, as our Author describes it, an *Ease* given to tender Consciences, all Laws are consistent with it, the Penalties of which no Sectarist can incur for *Conscience sake*, barely for serving God in his own Way. If our Author performs his Promise, of solidly replying to what Sir *H.* lays down concerning the *Corporation and Test Acts*, that according to their plain Meaning and Intent, *Occasional Conformists* stand excluded from Places, I hope the Weakness and scandalous Faults of this first Performance will be aton'd for, by the Exactness of the Second. From what we have before remark'd, it appears, that Sir *H. Mackworth's* Queries, concerning the Consistency of the *Toleration Act* and *Occasional Bill*, are proper Appeals to the Common Sense of all Mankind, besides our Author, as importing the Negation of no One Thing, that is not notoriously and undeniably false, *As that there is any Word or Clause in that Act, which supposes Dissenters to be qualify'd for Offices; that this Bill subjects 'em to any Penalties for serving God after their own Way; in particular, to the Loss of any Part of their Property.* For we have before shewn it to be against the Nature of Government, that the *Offices of State* should ever become *Freeholds*, by proving, that the Legislature may, as it judges most for the Advantage of the Publick, determine, who shall bear a Part in the Administration, and who shall be excluded from it: And those who are liable to Prosecutions and Fines, if they should presume to exercise that Authority, for which they are by Law disqualify'd, may yet enjoy the most absolute Liberty of Conscience: A Law inflicting Penalties on Dissenters, for that Crime, no more encroaches on the *Toleration*, than those Laws which punish them for Theft and Murder: It does not restrain 'em from doing any thing they think necessary for Salvation, but only from what They, who represent the Government, judge Incompatible with the Publick Safety, and what the Dissenters, did they rightly consider the Terms of Salvation, would judge as inconsistent with it.

P. 47. Having thus evinc'd, That the Dissenters have no Right to a boundless Toleration in general, and that the Occasional Conformists in particular, have less Reason to lay claim to it; and, that Depriving and Incapacitating them is no Persecution, but a proper Means to dispose them to Conviction; and, that 'tis no way Inconsistent with the Act of Toleration, we come to consider the last Position, which our Author calls the Main Objection; That Supposing Dissenters were capable by the Act of Toleration; or any other Law, of Publick Places and Employments, yet they ought not to be suffer'd to continue so, because they are *HYPOCRITES* and *SCHISMATICKS*. Our Author to shew that the Charge of Hypocrisy ought not to Impeach their Right (as he terms it) to Offices, defines an Hypocrite to be one, whose Actions are inconsistent with his Principles, and who is Conscious that they are so, Supposing which Definition to be just and true, I shall join Issue with our Author, and undertake to demonstrate, that this Character is very deservedly fixt upon the Occasional Conformists. What has been before said on this Point, might be sufficient to determine it, but because nothing shall be wanting most effectually to establish this Accusation, we will omit no Weight

Arguments our Author produces, but will exhibit them in their full Weight and Force, which will be found very inconsiderable. The whole strength whereof, consist in these Two Propositions, First, *That a bare Inconsistency in Principles and Practices is not sufficient to prove a Man an Hypocrite, unless it is also prov'd, that he is Conscious of this Inconsistency, and through Malice and Design, guilty of it.* Secondly, *That tho' this should be prov'd upon the Occasional Conformists, there are other Men in the World, as much deserving the same Imputation, and particularly some Men in the Church.* For the proof of the First, we are told, that a *Man may be Inconsistent in his Actions and Principles, through Ignorance, Inadvertency and Mistake, and consequently, such an one may be denominated a weak Man, but not a Hypocrite.* That this is not the Case of the Occasional Conformists, will appear from a right View of it. They tell us, that they believe our Church's Rubrick, which enjoins, that none should publickly Receive the Consecrated Elements, unless Kneeling, is an Ecclesiastical Usurpation, which they ought not to countenance or abet, nor can comply with, innocently: And yet they always present themselves in this Posture, when they come to receive the Blessed Eucharist in our Church: They maintain their Separation from her, upon no less an Accusation, than that *she is Corrupt in Her Faith and Worship*; and require a Reformation in both, to render Her Communion Legal; and yet to Qualify themselves for Preferment, can in Despight of this publick Charge, join in the most Solemn Profession of the one, and Circumstantial Performance of the other: They tell us that greater Edification, and an higher Advancement in Spiritual Improvement, is their main Argument for entring into Religious Confederacies, in Opposition to the Church; and yet they can Communicate with it, upon Occasion for their temporal Advantage when it lies equally under this Defect. They Reproach our Church for want of Discipline, and the weakness of Her Authority, whilst they themselves deny a necessary Part of that Authority, the Power of Refusing the Sacrament to any profligate Wretch, whom it may Capacitate for an Office. Either we must suppose Occasional Conformists incapable of any Reflection in the World, and much Weaker Brethren, much more Unqualified for Offices, than they wou'd be thought to be, or assert that in all these plain and undeniable Instances, they cannot but be Conscious of the greatest Inconsistency betwixt their Principles and Practices. But to retort an Argument upon our Author, which ought for ever Silence him; he has acknowledg'd himself, in the Dissenter's Name, Guilty of this Charge, by Asserting in these express Words, *That the Dissenters would be Hypocrites, should they not Worship God, in that which they take to be the most acceptable manner*; and as positively in the very same Period affirming, *That the Dissenters think their way of Worship, more Acceptable to God, than that Establish'd by Law*: The necessary and most obvious Consequence of which Positions, is that Dissenters are, by their own Concession, guilty of Hypocrisy, whensoever their Occasions lead 'em from their Conventicles to the Church: *Out of your own Mouths shall ye be condemn'd, O ye Wicked Servants!*

P. 6.

Neither will the Recriminations our Author is pleas'd, out of his great Charity, so falsely to cast upon the Church, any ways alleviate his



his heinous Crime, or lessen the Infamy of his own Concession: We may say with him in the Psalmist, *Thou givest thy Mouth to Evil, and thy Tongue frameth Deceit: Thou sittest and speakest against thy Brother, thou slanderest thy own Mother's Son: Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thy self, but I will reprove thee.* The pretending Inconsistency of Going sometimes to a Cathedral, sometimes to a Parish-Church, sometimes to a Church subject to Episcopal Jurisdiction, sometimes to One exempted from it, has been before fully Confuted. And his other Instances of Hypocrisy, and Perjury, in the Church, are so highly reflecting upon the Government, that they deserve to be Confuted by it, not with *Argument*, but *Correction*; and are a sufficient Proof, that Penalties are the most proper Methods to work upon a Fanatick's Understanding. The Crimes laid to our Charge here, are, taking Oaths upon the occasion of a good Place, or Benefice, that a Title is the pretended Motion of the Holy Ghost, for Clergy-men to take Orders, that the Chapter's Electing a Bishop according to the *Conge d'eslire*, is Hypocrisy before God. But is our Author so stupid as to believe, that there's any Parity betwixt taking the Oaths and receiving the Sacrament, to qualify a Man for an Office? Is not the former a Security which every Man is obliged to give the Government, to which he comes in, upon Principle, and after faithfully adheres, and pays a constant Allegiance to? But do these Occasional Conformists either come to the Communion of our Church upon its Principles, or are they afterwards constant Members of it? If the Laws for the Clergy's Provision and Maintenance, have required, that every Man that is admitted into Holy Orders, shall have a Title, Does that *Legal, External* Condition exclude the *Evangelical, Call*, or *Internal* Condition? Is not the One required, as well as the Other? Or cannot a Man have a Motion of the Holy Ghost, either previous to, concurring with, or even without this Title? If a Chapter is obliged, under a Premunire, to comply with the *Conge d'eslire*, that is, to shew their Obedience to the Government, by approving of its Election of a Bishop, and they beseech God's Providence and Direction in it, where is the Hypocrisy in all these Cases? The Truth is, the Dissenters are resolved to engross the Holy Ghost to themselves, and think no one can be moved by the Spirit, but to rebel like themselves against their Superiors. Our Author was in the right, in Prefacing these Scandals upon the Church, with some mollifying Expressions, as being well conscious that such Language ought not to be born from the Dissenters, p. 49.

P, 49. This Charge of Hypocrisy, being so evidently made out against the Occasional Conformists, that our Author seems to distrust his own Defence, and give up the Cause; he has however another *Salvo* for their absolute Toleration, and urges, that *They ought not to be depriv'd of it, upon the Account of Hypocrisy, because it is no Civil Crime; as falling not under the Magistrates Cognizance, and therefore not punishable by any Human Law, or Power in this World, but only by God in the Next.* To which we reply, that Hypocrisy, tho' an Offence Immediately against God, is also, with respect to Mankind, a Violation of Justice; as being a Lye in Action, and may be so Circumstantiated, as to become no less Destructive to Civil, than Religious Societies. When Conscience

is made Use of, as a sanctify'd Pretence for disturbing the Peace and Order of a Nation, by Men who are only govern'd by their Interest; when they plead it for living in a State of Disobedience to their Superiours, whose Injunctions they can never submit to, but for mercenary Profit; and when their Reasons, for their *Occasional* Compliance with the Laws; so palpably contradict those for their *Stated* Violation of them, that no Man of common Sense, can really assent to both: In each of these Cases, much more when they all concur, *Hypocrisy* becomes a *Civil Crime*, and ought to be restrain'd upon a *Political*, as well as *Religious* Account. For althogh it is a Sin of a *Spiritual* Nature, and immediately subject to the Divine Inspection, yet ought it not therefore to be exempted from the Notice of the Magistrate: Because his Office Respects *All Sins Indifferently*, tho' some more indisputably belong to his Cognizance: And tho' the Morality of all our Actions, is wholly seated in the *Inner-Man*, and our *External* Performances don't constitute their Guilt: yet those Performances are *Signs* and *Indications* of the *Thoughts*, and Intentions of the Heart; and as *Such*, subject Offenders (and no less *Hypocrites*, than Others,) to Human Examination. Our Blessed Saviour himself has given us this, as a sure and infallible Rule of distinguishing *Hypocrites*, when they act their Parts under the most crafty and disguising Subtlety, and the most likely to secure 'em from Discovery, that even then, by *their Fruits we shall know them*: And what more *Fruitful* Proof can be given, than such an Irreconcilable Repugnancy in the Dissenters Principles and Practices, which openly tends to destroy all *Mutual Trust*, the great Band and Foundation of *Human Society*, and consequently strikes at the very Root of Government? The Magistrate doubtless, is not only *Permitted*, but is *Oblig'd*, as God's *Vice-Gerent* by any *Legal* Methods to restrain such a pernicious Act of *Hypocrisy*, which is as capable of Proof and Evidence, by its *Overt Acts*, as Murther, Robbery, Treason, or any other abominable Crime; for to leave the Practice of it, without a sufficient Penalty to prevent it, is to promote and encourage it.

Mat. 7. 16.

P. 50. §. 2. Our Author is here pleas'd, in the Name of the *Dissenters* to make a very merry Proposal to the *Church-Men*; which I dare also promise in *their* Name, they will very readily comply with; Namely, that *Occasional Conformists* shall contentedly stand excluded from all Offices, when those who have never taken the Oaths, or sign'd the Association, are excluded too. What *Military*, or *Civil Employments*, these *Latter* have, or are capable of, if this unaccountable Writer will be so kind as to inform me, I may perhaps farther promise him for his Reward, to get him the *same Preferment*: And when his Hand is in, for reconciling Contradictions, I wou'd beseech him to acquaint me, how *Occasional Conformists* can *THINK*, that their Country won't want their Service, when all *Hypocrites* are debarr'd from Places, whilst they also *THINK*, at the same time that there would be thereby, fewer Officers, than Places to be supply'd? But *THINKING* Absurdities is so Habitual to them, that they may be suppos'd even to *THINK*, that the Preferments of this Kingdom may be *Out-Numbr'd* by fewer Officers than



than there are Preferments in it. Can any Tenet be ever too monstrous for such Men to swallow? Will their Faith stick at *Transubstantiation*, that can down with such gross Propositions? But let us here observe their *Extraordinary Charity*, for the want whereof they so often Bellow against their Adversaries; rather than own this Accusation of Hypocrisy, which they find utterly impossible to shift-off, or deny; they are resolv'd to arraign all Mankind for the same Sin, and think to make themselves *Innocent*, by charging the *Whole World*, as *Guilty* of it: As if there was no such thing as *Veracity*, or *Sincerity*, upon Earth, because it cannot be found among the *Dissenters*.

P. 51. Having thus prov'd the *Charge of Hypocrisy* against the Dissenters, and therein fix'd a Bar against their boundless Toleration, the next thing they desire to be heard to, by this their Representative, is the other Charge of *SCHISM*: To which they plead not *Guilty*; or supposing them to be *Guilty* of it, yet, that *Schism* ought not to debar them from the Right of this Toleration. To prove the First they tell us, That they are not guilty of *Schism*, because they are not *Uncharitable*, for that there is no other Sense of that Word in Scripture, than a meer Breach of *Charity*. To which we Answer: That it is a Fundamental Law of *Natural Religion*, to Love, Honour, and Sympathize with all Men, as partaking of the same Common Nature, and Infirmities with our selves; which has been very much advanc'd and improv'd in its Perfection, by that exalted Measure and further Enforcement of it laid down in Christianity, of *Doing as we would be done by*, a Rule of no less Compass and Latitude, than the whole World. But to suppose that *Charity*, the Object whereof, is far more Extensive than the Church of Christ, is yet the peculiar and sole Bond of Unity betwixt its Members, and that which severs and distinguishes it, from the rest of the World, is no less absurd than to affirm, that the Parts of Christ's Mystical Body, are as strictly and vitally United to Jews and Pagans, as to one another. Therefore tho' *Charity* is the Universal Cement of Unity in the whole World, yet it is not it self, the sole sufficient Principle of Unity to the Body of Christ's Church. For to make the Catholick Church, and its several Parts, One Body, there is not only required the same *Charity*, but the same Faith, the same Hope; and besides all this, nothing less than an *External Visible Communion* in the same Sacraments and Prayers, and other Religious Offices, which the Church, by the Authority of Christ and his Apostles enjoins, can Perfectly Unite Christians in One Visible Body. Therefore he that Seperates causelessly from this Visible External Communion with the Catholick Church, as the Dissenters do from the External Communion of our Church (a sound Part of the Catholick Church, is a *SCHISMATICK*, let him talk never so much of *Charity*. Besides this Supposition of *Charity's* being the sole Tye of Unity among Christians, quite inverts the Order of things propos'd in Scripture, in which the Unity of the Church is represented as a principal Inducement to that Love, and *Charity* which is due from one Christian to another. We being many (says St. Paul) are one Body in Christ, and every one Members one of another, Rom. 12. 5. whence he concludes That we ought to be kindly affection'd one towards another, with Brotherly Love, to Weep with those that

Weep, and Rejoice with those that Rejoice. Which Reasoning of the Apostle shews, that the *Fundamental Principle* of Unity betwixt Christians, is as *Antecedent* to their mutual Good-Will, as the *Motive* of any Duty is to the *Practice* of it. But our Author here endeavours to justify his *Schism*, from a further Argument drawn from *Charity*, *That the diversity of Gifts and Administrations proceeding from the same Spirit, and sound amongst the Dissenters, may be of great Service and Advantage to the whole Body of the Church.* In Answer to which we must take the Freedom to tell our Conceited Author, that if St. Paul understood this Argument taken from the *Diversity of Gifts and Administrations of the same Spirit*, it is a very forcible Argument against *Schism* as he himself urges it at large *Ch. 12. 1 Cor.* Where this Learned Apostle with noble Eloquence and convincing Reason has shewn, that tho' there are *Diversities of Gifts from the same Spirit for every Man to profit withal*, yet the *Design of those Gifts is not to Rend, but Unite many Members in one Body*: which is Illustrated by a lively Similitude drawn from a *Natural Body*, wherein all the Members tho' many, and endow'd with different Functions, are united by the same Spirit, yet all co-operate with the same Mind and preserve a mutual Union: from whence the Apostle infers this *Conclusive Analogy*, to the Church the *Mystical Body of Christ*, *That there should be no SCHISM in the Body, but the Members should have the same Care one of another.* V. 25. From whence also we may infer, that if the Dissenters have *Diversity of Gifts from the same Spirit* (as they Arrogantly boast, with what Reason let the World Judge) these gifts should rather animate and incite them to promote the Service of God in preserving the Unity of the Catholick Church of Christ. But thro' this whole Epistle wherein the Gifts of the *Holy Ghost* are particularly enumerated, We cannot find the least Mention of the Gifts of *Canting, Extemporary Prayer, of Rebellion, Sacrilege, Timeserving, and Occasional Communion.* But these things forsooth the Dissenters are no ways conscious of, if we can believe this Author. They Wipe their Mouth (like Solomon's Strumpet) and cry, *God who has the only Prerogative of Judging their Hearts, knows their Consciences; and what Evil have they done?* Doubtless God knows their Hearts, and Men too may make not an Uncharitable Guess at 'em from their apparent Actions, without the Necessity of That Glass by which they wish'd poor King James to look into their Breasts, to discover the SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS of their Occasional Conformists: and the MUTUAL CONSCIOUSNESS of their Dissenting Brethren. But our Author will not relinquish this Argument of *Charity* to excuse his *Schism*, without wresting several Passages of the Scripture to support it. Three whereof are evident Confutations of what he advances, that *Schism*, so much inveigh'd against, by the Holy Penmen, is *Uncharitableness only*, and manifestly prove, that *Schism* may consist as well in the Mistakes of Christians, as their Disaffection to one another. Those Words in the Epistle to the Romans, Chap. 16. Vers. 17, 18. *Mark them which Cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrine which you have Learned, and avoid them: For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own Belly, and by good Words and fair Speeches deceive the Hearts of the Simple* (which, by the way



way is the most exact Pourtraiture of our *Schismatical* Preachers and their Congregations) relate to those Differences betwixt Christians, which arose from their *Errors*, grounded on the plausible Insinuations of *Hereticks*, and the Credulity of weak, unstable and silly People: That Passage of St. Paul, *Rom. 12. 3. Not to think of our selves more highly than we ought to think, but to think soberly*, was doubtless intended to regulate Men's *Opinions* of themselves; whatever Instance therefore of *Schism* it's directed against, it consists in the irregular Acts of the *Understanding*: Lastly, that Exhortation of the Apostle, *1 Cor. Chap. 1. Vers. 10. I beseech you Brethren by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye shall speak the same thing, and that there be no Schism among you, but that ye be perfectly join'd together in the same Mind, and in the same Judgment*, is a manifest Recommendation, not of Unity of Inclination, but of Doctrine, Faith, and Sentiment, and very plainly imply that the Guilt of *Schism* is incurr'd by *Heterodoxy*, and not only by want of *Charity*. But supposing that there was no other kind of *Schism* but *Uncharitableness*; how does it appear that the Dissenters are not guilty of *Schism*? For to run over the chief Properties of *Charity*, and apply them to the Dissenters, since they are so fond of odd-Application of Scripture: Are they not *pust up* with their *imaginary Gifts* of the Spirit, and their greater Edification, and the Rights they dream of in their Toleration? Do they not *envy* the Church her Dignities and Offices, desire to see her stript of these *Eye-sores*, (as they call 'em) and to make her naked by a *Reformation* of her Lands and Revenues into their Pockets, and do they not rather than lose the Enjoyment of 'em, even turn Apostates to their own Principles to gain 'em? Do they not *behave themselves unseemly* in God's Worship? Are they not *easily provok'd* by the Occasional Bill, and every thing that seems to restrain an unbounded Liberty of Thinking, Speaking and Acting as they will? They are apt indeed to *hope* any thing, and *believe* every thing but what the Church enjoins, but are so far from being willing to *bear*, or *endure* all things, that they cry out *Persecution* or *Murder*, if they are not only *Trusted*, but *Preferr'd*. It is true in this they seek not their *Own*, but the *Rights* of the Church: They *Think no Evil* in Sedition or Regicide, but allow every thing Just and Lawful, which is for their Interest: Nay they cannot *forbear THINKING* so, and therefore they *Rejoice not in Truth*, but in *Iniquity*, in Propagating *Error*, *Schism*, and *Infidelity*: So that we may conclude in the words of the Apostle, that they have no more *Clarity* than the *Gift of Prophecy*, or the *Understanding of Mysteries and Knowledge*; and tho' they pretend to *speak with the Tongues* and *Sincerity of Saints and Angels*, they are meer *sounding Brass*, and *ringling Sybals*, all Noise, Impertinence and Emptiness; and consequently, upon their own Principles, being thus undeniably Defective in *Clarity*, cannot but acknowledge the Charge of *Schism*. Which (in our Author's words) is always attended with *Proneness to Strife*, with *Selfish Designs*, with *Pride and Insolence*, with a *partial Fondness of some Men*, and an *unreasonable Slight and Hatred of others*, as it is necessary Effects and Consequences. Not but that these Vices may be doubtless found *without Schism*,

*Schism*, but on the other Hand *Schism* is never found without them: So that *Uncharitableness* can't be said to be the *Formal Reason* of *Schism*; as if *Schism* consisted in nothing else, but to be one of those many ill Products that flow from it. For certainly *Schism* is contracted by all Violations of *Church Unity*, whatsoever, by dissolving any of those sacred Tyes, which are the Bands of Communion and join us to Christ and one another, either by *Renouncing* that *One Hope* in which we are *All* call'd, or that *One Faith* which we are *All* oblig'd to *profess*, by despising and deserting those *Sacraments* of which we are all bound to partake, and the Efficacy of which is then only certain, when administer'd by those Persons whom Christ has authoriz'd, or, Lastly, by *forsaking* the *Communion* of the *Church* and its constant Assemblies, and by Consequence not *Glorifying God*, with *one Mind and one Mouth*, as he commanded us. Since therefore all our *Protestant Dissenters* demand a REFORMATION of the FAITH once delivered to the *Saints*, and have relinquish'd a sound Part of the Christian Church; since many of them condemn those holy Elements, by partaking of which, we become *One Body*, or never receive them, but to serve their *Worldly Interest*, and *renounce* even that *Baptism* without which we cannot be Members of the Church; since they condemn that Order of Men, as *Anti-Christian*, or reject it as superfluous, without whose Commission, when it may be had, and that innocently, none can derive a Right from Christ to exercise the *Priestly Office*, and administer the *Sacraments*; upon all these Accounts, the whole Body of the *Dissenters* are *Schismatics* from the *Catholick Church*.

P. 54. Yet our sagacious Author, out of his great Skill and deep Learning in *Antiquity* and *Chronology*, is pleas'd to oblige the World with a very surprizing Discovery, that this *Notion of Schism* is altogether a *New Notion*, invented very lately, within these 15 or 16 Hundred Years by the *Ancient Fathers*, and the *Modern Divines*. But whether the sound Part of the *Catholick Church*, *Ancient and Modern*, have not agreed in this *Notion of Schism*, which we have laid down as deducible from Scripture, consonant to the *Apostolical Doctrine* and Declaration of the Church, because we would not trouble the Reader with a tedious Repetition of what has been so often and fully stated in other Writers, we shall refer him to that Learned, Judicious, and Elaborate Treatise of Dr. Maurice against Baxter and Clarkson, intituled a *Vindication of the Primitive Church*, wherein the Point of *Congregational Episcopacy* is most inconstantly disprov'd. But to convince our Author, that he as well understands his own, as that excellent Writer's Arguments, may it not be here seasonably remark'd, that even upon what he himself advances, the Dissenters are Guilty of *Schism*, in a Separation from a Lawful Bishop, that is Guilty neither of *Heresy*, *Apostacy*, or *Immorality*, (admitting this absurd Position, That a Bishop is only Pastor of one Congregation.) From whence a very strange Argument is drawn, to prove the Dissenters not Guilty of *Schism*, because they did not Desert their Pastors Ejected in 62, proved Guilty, both by the Laws of GOD and Man, of *Heresy*, *Apostacy*, and the most scandalous *Immorality*. That



is, in plain Words, they were not *Schismatics*, because they continued to be *Schismatics*, and do still persevere in their Schism, by Deserting their *Lawful Parochial Pastor*. But let us by the way observe this new Kind of *Occasional Conformity*: Our Author can, to serve a Turn, Degradate a *Bishop* into a *Presbyter*; and for another, Exalt a *Meer Presbyter* into the Character of a *Bishop*, which can Occasionally Lose its Odious Anti-christian Malignity upon the additional advantage of a Thousand Pounds per *Annum*: But no wonder he thus confounds Orders, who so often confounds himself.

P. 55. Yet our Author is resolv'd, having Confuted the *Ancient Fathers*, in their *Novel Notions*, without Quoting one of them, to bestow an equal Share of his Learned Civility on our *Modern English Divines*, whose Divinity he is pleas'd to Censure, as being any thing else besides *Scripture*. He represents 'em, P. 56. as setting up a *Theological Scare-crow* in their Definition of *Schism*, That it is an Unnecessary Separation from a *Lawful Establish'd Church*. They have indeed Unanimously Determin'd this to be a great and signal Instance of *Schism*, that the Dissenters stand Chargeable with it, on a double account, who causelessly Separate from a Church, that is allow'd by them a *True Church*, and which is also Establish'd by the Laws of their Country. But certainly no Man, that is not equally a Stranger, both to their Writings and the Truth, could affirm, that the Generality of the *English Divines* think the Establishment of a Church, necessary to make Separation from it, a *Schism*: For they all Unanimously hold (what we observ'd before) that if *Presbytery*, *Independency*, *Quakerism*, or any other Sect of our Protestant Dissenters, enjoy'd the same Favour and Protection that our Laws give the Church, yet that all Separatists from our Church, would be as Truly Guilty of *Schism*, as they are now, tho' not of *Schism* under the same Aggravations. But supposing our Author had fairly represented their Opinion, let us see how well he has confuted it: Because St. Paul stiles the Contention of the *Corinthians*, who did not forsake their Assembling themselves together, *Schism*, our Author therefore denies, that a much greater Breach between Christians is a *Schism*, according to the *Scripture* Notion of it. Had this shallow Reasoner understood, but the most common Rules and Maxims of *Logick*, it is impossible he should have Argued thus Ridiculously, and drawn such a Conclusion, that so evidently contradicts 'em, and can't but shock a Man's Understanding at the first Proposal. To turn it in an Instance which he is well acquainted with, and to shew him the Consequence: Because Taking Arms against the King's Person, and Imprisoning him was, Sin, therefore Deposing and Murdering him was no Sin at all. It is hard to say, which is a greater Offence against Reason, these Mens Practices, or the Arguments they Defend them by. Our Author to shew, that the Dissenters are not included in this Definition of *Schism*, attempts to prove, That Separation, when not restrain'd to an unnecessary Separation from a *Lawful Establish'd Church*, does not include the *Schism* of our Separatists that no general Sence of that Word can be assign'd, whereby many constant Members of our Church, may not be prov'd equally *Schismatics*, as well as they.

This

This is a way of arguing, just as conclusive, as if to disprove the ordinary Definition of a *Square*, we should say, that its *entire Notion* is not comprehended in the *general Idea* of *Figure*; and that no *universal* Sense of that Word can be assign'd, in which it does not *equally* agree to a *Square* or a *Triangle*. But to examine our Author a little in his *Logick*, does any *part* of a just and adequate Definition express the *whole* Nature of the *Thing Defined*? Are not Terms us'd in all such Definitions, to signify, as well in what the *Definitum* agrees with, as in what it *differs* from other things? They who describe *Schism* to be a *Separation from a Lawful Establish'd Church*, don't (as our Author argues) conceive it to be a *bare Separation*, but *Separation*, with several additional *Ideas* annex to it. None therefore can, in Consequence of this Definition, be accus'd of *Schism*, for some Differences between 'em in the Modes and Circumstances of their Worship, and the Jurisdiction they are under, which are either allow'd or enjoin'd by the Laws of their Country, such as are all Differences between *Conformists* here enumerated by our Author.

P. 57. Our Author's only Proof, that *the Separation of the Dissenters is not unnecessary*, amounting only to this, that they don't **THINK** it to be so, (the general Argument of this empty Treatise) can be of no Force with any Man, who disowns their *Infallibility*. A *needless* thing no more becomes *necessary*, than a *sinful* one, because some Men *think* it so; because they are under no Necessity of being mistaken; for such a right Application of their Faculties, as they are oblig'd to, had prevented, and would have instantly remov'd their Error: But this Matter has been fully stated before, and we shall not follow this Writers Example, in nauseating our Reader with impertinent Tautologies.

P. 58. Our Author's next Exception against the foresaid Account of *Schism*, is, that it is a *Contradiction to it self*, which he undertakes to prove, because there may be a *Separation from a Lawful Church*, for the sake of better *Edification*, which is not *Schism*. Whereby if he shews any thing besides his own *Confidence*, it is at the most, that this Definition of *Schism* is contrary to that *Affertion*, and therefore False, upon Supposition that it is true; but not that it is a *Contradiction to it self*. This can appear only by shewing, that the Terms of it destroy each other, and the impossibility that the same Church, should be *Lawful*, *Establish'd*, and *causelessly Separated* from. But was *better Edification* a sufficient Rule for separating from a *Lawful Church* (which we have before disprov'd) it would not therefore justify Separation from a *Lawful Establish'd Church*: nor, consequently vindicate our Separatists from the Charge of *Schism*, according to the Definition before. Our Author's Method of Invalidating this, is by shewing, that the several *Parts* of it, taken a *sunder*, don't explain the Nature of the *whole* thing defin'd. Before he told us, that *Separation may not be Schism*, here he says, that *Separation from a Lawful Church may not be Schism*; in the next Paragraph he tells us, that *Separation from an Establish'd Church may not be Schism*, from whence he infers, that *Schism does not consist in Separation from a Lawful Establish'd Church*.

This



This Fallacy is so palpably Gross, that it is impossible it should pass, even on the prejudiced and benighted Understanding of a Dissenter. By Parity of Reason we may argue, that a *Figure* may not be a *Square*, that *Quadrilateral*, *Aequilateral*, and *Aequiangular Figures*, severally taken, may not be *Squares*; and thence gather, that *Figure*, with all these Properties in Conjunction, is not the *Adequate* Notion of a *Square*, and by the same Sophistical Reasoning, overturn all the Definitions in the World: Which being Enumerations of the *Simple Idea's*, contain'd in the *Complex* Notion of the *Thing Defin'd*, this plainly can never be fully describ'd by less than all the Parts of it taken together, since less than all these *united* don't make up the *whole*. Neither will *better Edification* be found a Reason of any *Weight*, to justify this *Schism* from a *Lawful Church*: For as the *Edification* refers to the *whole Mystical Body* of Christ, consider'd under the *Apostolical* Analogy of *God's Building*, so it can be no more promoted by Divisions among its Members, than an House can be erected, by scattering its Materials, or strengthen'd by being pull'd in Pieces. And as it denotes the *Spiritual Improvement* of *Particular Christians*, that can as little be advanc'd, by deserting any sound Part of the *Catholick Church*, since that can never advance their Growth in Holiness, which is forbid in Scripture, as destructive of their *Spiritual Life*.

P. 58. §. 3. But our Author says, that the Word *Establish'd*, is superfluous in this Definition of *Schism*, and makes it redundant: By an *Establish'd Church*, is meant a Church, to which the Laws of any particular Nation require Conformity, whether these Laws give any Privilege to its Members, or not: And tho' such *Establishment* does not infallibly argue the *Good Constitution* of any Church, yet that being *presuppos'd*, it lays an *Additional Obligation* on Men to Communicate with it; and makes Separation from it, which before was criminal, become more *exceedingly sinful*. The Authority of the Magistrate and Church, to make Laws about *Spiritual* Matters, being here only deny'd, in bold and precarious Assertions (our Author's only Arguments) we refer the Reader to what is already said on that Subject.

P. 59. The *English Divines*, as we before observ'd, don't hold *All Schism* to be a Separation from a *Lawful Establish'd Church*; but only, that all Separation from *such a Church*, is *Schism*. They indeed derive Men's Obligation to Communicate with the *Church of England*, as well from the *Divine Law*, which equally binds in all States of it, as *Humane*: So that this Writer is very Inconsistent with their Notions of *Schism*, in asserting, that Men might be *Guilty* of it, in the more *Primitive Ages* of Christianity, before any part of the Church was so much as Tolerated by the Magistrate. But our Author thinks he has carry'd his Point, in confidently affirming, that this Charge of *Schism* is entirely taken off by the Act of Toleration, which has dispens'd with the Penal Laws, and made the Dissenters as much *Establish'd*, as the *Church of England*. Certainly, no two things in the World can be separated by clearer Marks of Distinction, than those which are here so grossly confounded, Toleration, and Establishment. The Magistrate may indeed dispense with the Penalty due to Disobedience, but that Dispensation is so far from taking away, that it does not so much as alter, the Nature of *Schism*, which no Establishment, no Privileges, or Immunities whatsoever, can

*Legitimate.* But, does our Author believe, that the Act of Toleration has Repeal'd or Abrogated the Act of Uniformity? This Matter has been so fully and clearly settled by the ingenious Mr. Norris, in *His Charge of Schism continued*, that it admits not of any further Dispute, or Reply. But here let us observe, what an unexpected Use the Dissenters make of their Toleration, or indeed any Favour, which they always magnify and extend, not only beyond the Grant, but to the utmost Prejudice and Disadvantage of their Benefactors: For certainly nothing, but the most astonishing Inference in the World, cou'd induce any Man to maintain so bold and presumptuous an Assertion as this of our Author's, *That the Churches of the Dissenters are as much ESTABLISH'D by the Act of Toleration, as the CHURCH OF ENGLAND by the Act of Uniformity.* The next RIGHT they will claim, will be the *Estates and Revenues of the Church*, which they will demand as an equal Property and Endowment of their Conventicles. Are these the *Godly Trumpeters* against *Usurpation, Impositions and Encroachments*? Does their *Christian Liberty* authorize them to seize the *Legal Privileges of the Church*? Let 'em Caut as long as they can find Fools enough to believe 'em, yet this will be found infallibly true, that the quiet Enjoyment of their Opinions under the Protection of the Government, will not satisfy their craving and swallowing Consciences, without a powerful Competition with, if not a Superiority over the *Establish'd Church*. Do not these overbearing Malecontents bid their Legislators Defiance, and, in plain Terms, tell 'em they stand upon as good a Foundation as themselves? When a Faction thus dares to dispute it with their Superiors, it is high time for them to look about them; to prevent Their own standing in need of that Toleration, they have granted to Others.

P. 60. By this time, I hope the Weakness of our Author's Reasoning is sufficiently understood, that he falsely ascribes the Definition he has given of Schism to the *English Divines*, and that supposing it true, it is however applicable to the Dissenters, that their Separation is, even in their own Opinion, unnecessary, and allowing, that tho' Schism is not contain'd in the general Idea of Separation, and that Separation from a Lawful, or from an Establish'd Church, were not Schism, yet that all Separation from a Church, both Lawful and Establish'd, is always a Schism.

P. 60, §. 2. But our Author, finding that none of all these Reasons will bear the Weight he would lay upon them, has one last Retreat to secure the Dissenters from this unavoidable Charge of Schism: and that is, the poor Assistance of this silly Distinction, by which he thinks his Adversary's Argument, not only put by, but retorted upon him, *That they are the Separatists, who force 'em to separate, by their unlawful Impositions, that they don't exclude themselves, but are excluded by the Church.* To which we Reply, that as to the Matter of Impositions, it is already answer'd. And it may be sufficient here to add, that they who separate from a Lawful Establish'd Church, thro' an erroneous Belief that Conformity to it is sinful, deprive themselves of the Benefit of its Communion: did they but impartially consider the Terms upon which they might enjoy it, they cou'd not but discern the Lawfulness and Expediency of them. Such therefore are not excluded from the Communion of their Brethren, by their *Governours*, but by their own voluntary Prejudices, and fantastical Obstinacy, they are so far from being



being driven from it, that they as properly desert it, as *Apostates* the Christian Religion, who renounce the Faith for the sake of some Articles, which our Saviour obliges 'em to profess, and to which they will not reconcile their Reason. Our Author is pleas'd here to make use of an Instance to illustrate his false Argument, about *Fixing unnecessary Rules in Conversation*, which he says he is as much averse to, as imposing any Rules to be observ'd in *Divine Worship*, and wou'd have both left at large, to the most dissolute Latitude and profligate Licentiousness. Shou'd a Man place Religion or Prudence in Singularity and Moroseness, in detesting the most common and innocent Decencies, and acting in Defiance of Custom, I might, without the gross Imputation of a *Mad-man*, fix such Rules of Conversation, to which this Author wou'd not submit. But wou'd not he deserve that odious Character, who thus, without the least Pretence of Reason, denounc'd War against all Mankind and their Manners?

P. 61. But, to shut up this Argument against *Schism*, this Author proposes a very Important Question, which ought, by no means, to be pass'd by without an Answer; namely, *From what Church in England they esteem Separation to be Schism, who define it to be a Separation from a Lawful Establish'd Church?* Which very nice and profound Difficulty we shall solve with another as intricate a Question. Is there any other Church of England, but that which our Laws have establish'd, and require Conformity to? or can our Author be so weak as to imagine, that the *Jacobites* and *Non-jurors* think, that those Laws enjoin Communion with their separate Assemblies? But the *Non-jurors* are here fetch'd in by head and shoulders, not so much from any Offence to the Government as to the Dissenters; because some of their learned Writers have appear'd, with so much Reason, Strength, and efficacious Eloquence in this Controversy against Occasional Conformity. Certainly Truth and Argument are the same, and are no less valuable, let them come from what Quarter they will; but more fully to answer this Objection, we desire our Author to remember what he says in the last page of his Book, That he ought industriously to have avoided mixing Personal Matters with his Dispute, it being of no importance who writes, but what is written. And certainly it can never be thought any more a Prejudice to the Church of England, that the *Non-jurors* should have shewn an hearty and zealous Concern for its Establishment, in confuting a Practice, which visibly endanger'd it; than it can be suppos'd for the Advantage of the Dissenters, that *Deists*, *Atheists* and *Socinians* have appear'd in the Defence of Occasional Conformity; whose profess'd Hatred to all True Religion, must doubtless be always more offensive to all good Christians, than the Other's Unfortunate Non-compliance with the Government. P. 70.

Thus we have prov'd the Charge of *Schism* on the Dissenters, according to what Notion soever it is laid, whether of the Scriptures, the Fathers, or the Modern Divines. And we need only refer the Reader to the Remarks on this Author's Dedication to the Queen, to shew, that the Dissenters cannot (as this Writer affirms) lay claim to the Character of Good Subjects, any more than they can to that of being Good Churchmen, and that, as their *Schism* has more than once led 'em into Rebellion, so it may do again, when they have that unlimited Toleration they plead for, or are not restrain'd by such a necessary Law, as this Bill against Occasional Conformity. These Separatists must de-

serve as ill from the State, as they do from the Church, who dare defend their *Schism* by such Arguments, as will equally serve to justify Rebellion, by extending *Christian Liberty* so far, as to deprive the Magistrate of all *Civil*, as well as *Ecclesiastical* Authority, all Right to command Men's Obedience in any case, which God has not expressly required it in. Such a Plea for their Separation as this, is destructive of all *Sovereignty*, or *Supremacy*, with Relation either to our *Laws*, or *Canons*; and is, in the last Result of it, coincident with the Traiterous Principles of those Puritanical Rebels the *Fifth-Monarchy-Men*. Nor are they less dispos'd to Sedition, who found their *Claim to Toleration* upon such an insolent *Maxim* as this, that *a Subject's Obedience is only due to the Laws, when they appear to command, not solely* justa, p. 27. *but Utilia*, that is, what he THINKS expedient to be done, as well as what he may lawfully do. But, supposing that *Schismatics*, as such, may be innocent Members of the State, yet can those ever be call'd so, who profess and propagate these mutinous Opinions, and found their *Claim to a Toleration* upon what cannot but render 'em dangerous to be tolerated? If severe Penalties are due to those Subjects who acknowledge a Foreign Power (tho' that Acknowledgment may proceed from the almost irresistible Force of Prejudice and Education) doubtless those who *disown all Power whatsoever* in the State, ought not to be intitled to its Places of Honour and Profit, Encouragements only due to the best, and not to the worst of Subjects, if they can be intitl'd so much as to the Name of a Subject, who are ever inclinable to rebel.

P. 62. Having thus confuted our Author's Pleas, 1st, For the Dissenters stated Dissent from the Church. 2ly, For their Occasional Conformity to it. 3ly, For the Right they pretend to an absolute Toleration. We come in the last Place to consider, How far it is the Interest of the Government to grant them this Unlimited Indulgence. What has been already said, abundantly proves, that to grant the Dissenters, that Unlimited Toleration which they claim, is against the Interest of the Government, if, as our Author here allows, the Duty and Interest of it mutually suppose and infer each other. This Writer is pleas'd, out of his usual good Manners, in very magisterial Terms, to tell Her Majesty, that it is her Duty to give them this Toleration, a very sawcy way of asking so mighty a Favour, especially considering how ill-qualify'd his Faction is to talk of their Prince's Duty, who scarce ever remember'd their own? Our Author had laid it before down, as their Grand Maxim, that Governours, p. 8. by commanding what God has not enjoin'd, entrench upon the Legislative Power of our Saviour; by which, as they have rendred all Obedience to Government, Precarious, as being founded upon Usurpation, does it not highly concern the Legislature to tie up such Men, who assert this Universal Liberty from their Power, by some particular Law, that may restrain this wild Rebellious Licentiousness, which they impiously pretend to establish upon the Scripture, in Opposition to all Civil Injunctions? But they tell Her Majesty that the enacting any such Law is to weaken the Government, by discouraging, and disabling Sober, Industrious, Wealthy and Frugal Men, and would deprive the Nation of their Service in all publick Employments in the Camp, Fleet, and Senate. In answer to which we may remember, that this very Author, in his p. 8. Dedication to the Queen, in the name of the Protestant Dissenters, told Her, that publick Disasters are their greatest Security, and publick Mercies their greatest Dangers: and can She expect any faithful Assistance from such Men's  
Courage



Courage in our *Fleets* and *Armies*, or their Policy in Civil Employments, or their Wisdom in Parliament? if they are *true* to their *suppos'd Interest* (and the World could never yet accuse them of the contrary) their unanimous Endeavours must be, to prolong the present bloody and expensive War. Their serious, tho' groundless Persuasion, that a speedy and prosperous Conclusion of it, would be followed by the *Ruine* of their *Party*, must determine those, who have always shewn such a restless and bitter Zeal in the Support of it, to check and retard, as they have Opportunity, the Success of our Arms, and put the Nation off with *Sieges* instead of *Victories*, to *starve* the glorious Cause we are engag'd in, with niggardly Supplies, and to *intercept* and *misapply* as much, even of these, as they can. And if we are to guess what further Advantages the Kingdom will receive from these Men, by what it has gain'd already; how serviceable they have been to it, by their *Wealth* and *Frugality*, by their *Loans* and *Informations*, by their prudent *Discharge* of their *Commissions* of the *Taxes* and the *Peace*, and in the *Bench* of *Aldermen*, *Common-Council-men* and *Assistants*, let the *Deficiencies* of the *Funds*, the *Heavy Debts* of the *Nation*, the *Animosities* and *Quarrels* they have rais'd throughout it, in all *Elections*, and the *unhappy Miscarriages* in the late Reign, be as convincing, as they are deplorable Instances. And whether the unlimited Indulgence of such *Catilines* in the State, that are for ever projecting its Ruin, be not the most effectual way, not only to *sap its Strength*, but overturn its very Foundation, and whether the Safety of the Publick does not absolutely require to have 'em *cashier'd out* of all its Offices and Employments, we appeal to the Experience of former times to determine, and the common Reason of Mankind to judge. But if this will not convince the Nation of the great Necessity of the *Occasional Bill*, these Men are resolv'd to give us a Reason that shall either open our Eyes, or shut them for ever. For, P. 63. our Author speaks out the Sense of his whole Party in plain Terms, telling Her Majesty, That if this Bill should pass into a Law, it would first tempt 'em to be discontented and uneasy, and then to spread these Discontents among their Fellow-Citizens, in the next place to betray us to Foreigners, by revealing the Counsels of the Government, and retarding its Business, till at last they combine together, enter into CONSPIRACIES, and don't stop at OPEN INSURRECTIONS. Let the most prejudic'd Reader judge, by the Character here drawn, by this Author himself, of the Dissenters, how much they disown the Principles and Practices of their Forefathers. But he adds, That passing the Occasional Bill will destroy the Balance betwixt the several Parties in England, break in upon the Prerogative, and ruine the Constitution it self. Now what can be the Author's Design in all this, but plainly to endeavour to intimidate the QUEEN and PARLIAMENT, to acquaint them, that the Dissenters, unless their insolent and unreasonable Demands be comply'd with, are already prepar'd and resolv'd to undertake and execute the most flagrant and abominable Crimes, to reveal the most important Secrets of State to our Enemies, to assist, by *Privy Conspiracies*, or *Open REBELLION*, that exorbitant Power, we have labour'd, at the Expence of so much Blood and Money, to reduce. Was there ever any Government in the World thus impudently huff'd and bully'd to its Face, or that wou'd put up such provoking Affronts and Reproaches without Resentment, and just Vengeance? If these Menaces have their designed Influence upon our Sovereign and

P. 16. of  
the Ded.

and Senate, the Balance betwixt the several Parties in England is actually destroy'd. They whose Loyal Principles will never suffer 'em to make such *Seditious Applications* to their Legislators, will be found even inflav'd to those, whose *Rebellious Dispositions* will as constant y prompt 'em to do it, as they have any Turn to be serv'd or Plot to be brought forth: The Success of these *Threats* in obstructing the *Occasional Bill*, will ever embolden them to dictate thus insolently to our *Parliament*, upon the *Freedom* of whose Debates, the making good and just Laws depends, and the whole Safety of that Kingdom, which these *Turbulent Schismatics* promise to betray: Prerogative and Liberty must give way to this *Rampant, Over-grown Faction*, whose arbitrary discontented Phrenzy must controul, not only the Sovereign Power, but that of the whole Legislature. But for fear these Inconveniencies, which they pretend would follow the *Passing the Bill at Home*, should not prove true, we are to be terrify'd with the Misfortunes that it might produce in *Our Affairs abroad*, that it will disoblige the *Scotch, Dutch*, and the rest of our Confederate Allies. But on the contrary, is it not certain that it cannot give cannot give the least Offence to the *Scotch Presbyterians*? For it only restrains a Practice which they most abhor, who not only detest *Occasional*, but *Constant Communion* with an *Episcopal Church*. Neither can it be suppos'd to weaken the Confidence which our *Protestant Allies* repose in us, because 'tis only putting a Law in execution, which several of them strictly observe; nor wou'd it deprive our Dissenters of any Advantages, which *Tolerated Protestants* in other Dominions enjoy, without being admitted to Offices of State, neither wou'd it expose them to any such Penalties as our *Roman Catholics* suffer, and therefore could beget no Jealousies in our *Papish Confederates*, who must be content to see the *Enemies* of our Religion, as well as those of *their Perswasion*, equally excluded the Government. But, by the way, I wou'd ask our Author a Question, What *Foreign States and Kingdoms* have to do with our enacting Laws, relating only to our own Nation? Did the *Treaty of Partition* oblige us to consult their Approbation and Consent, in securing our *Church and Establishment*? Or are we still to be govern'd by *Foreign Funtos*, and *Cabals of Fanaticks* harbour'd in *Republicks*?

P. 64. §. 1. But our Author still urges, that if the *Occasional Bill* should pass, the Church would be ruin'd, by weakning the State, whereon it depends. But is there the least Shadow of Truth in this Pretence? If the Bill pass into a Law, by the Interest of the *Church of England*, would not the *Civil Power* be plac'd in their Hands, who alone will use it for her Support? A Practice would be discontinued, which is the most odious Reproach to the Protestant Religion in the World; and affords such just Matter of Offence, not only to all good Christians, but to *Papists* and *Infidels*, and has been so great a Means of augmenting their Number. By this, the Reputation our Church has so justly Abroad, for her singular *Veracity* and *Temper*, would be very much Establish'd, as concurring in a Law, which all the *Moderate Reform'd Churches* Practice.

§. 2. *Ibid.* Our Author's last Argument, for suppressing the *Occasional Bill*, is, its *Unseasonableness* at present, from the Danger that we lye under of a potent Enemy Abroad, and the Necessity of an *Unanimity, Secrecy, and Vigour* in our Counsels and Enterprizes at Home. Now if our present Danger is from a foreign



reign Enemy, whose Counsels are more **Unanimous** and **Secret**, and his Enterprizes more **Vigorous** than Ours, that is doubtless an invincible Reason, for the immediate Passing this Bill: Since no *Unanimity* in our *Councils* can be expected, whilst compos'd of Men of Opposite Opinions and Interests; no *Privacy*, whilst such are admitted to them, who had rather reveal, if they can ruin the *Best-laid-Designs*, than the Reputation of its Success, should be ascrib'd to this or that particular *Minister*, *Commander*, or *Admiral*: Neither can we hope for any vigorous Execution of our Policies, whilst it is committed to such as are more dispos'd to thwart and frustrate each other, than to resist the *Common Enemy*. The *Occasional Bill* therefore that places the *Administration* in the Hands of *One Unanimous Set* of Men, can never be more **SEASONABLY** propos'd than in the present Juncture. The *Passing* it after our great late Success (which has so strangely alter'd the whole Affairs of *Europe*, and reduc'd the dangerous Power of *France*) wou'd either produce a *Glorious Peace*, or enable us to improve the Advantages we have obtain'd over our Enemies, with the utmost Steadiness and Vigour. But that no Argument may be wanting, our Author is pleas'd to turn his Style, and for once bestow a *Complement* on our Church (which before he omitted no Opportunity of loading with the most bitter Scandal and Reproach) and this is indeed so awkwardly manag'd, that it discovers, as much the Want of *Sincerity* in the Proposal, as of its Force in the Conclusion. He tells us, *our Church* wou'd receive a strange imaginary Advantage, in calling in the Aid of the Dissenters against Atheists, Deists and Socinians, if she wou'd not contend for this Bill: Truly we are wonderfully oblig'd to our Author for this Favour, by saying, that this Controversy is still depending, he supposes, that for want of the Dissenters Assistance, the Church has not yet gain'd any considerable Advantages over them in the Dispute; and that her Sons, after their long Contests with these Infidels, have not given a decisive Blow to their Cause; and that unless we can secure our *Common Religion* against their Attempts, by joining the Dissenters for our Confederates, 'twill remain doubtful, whether those are victorious, who have defended, or these who have oppos'd the Being of a God, the Authority of Scripture, and the Fundamentals of Christianity. But supposing, (which wretched Condescension, the Church must be reduc'd to the very lowest Ebb, to stoop to) that her Asserters of these Truths stood in such need of Assistance, yet the Aid afforded her by the Dissenters, in her last Controversy betwixt her and the Church of *Rome*, shews what powerful Succours she may expect from them in her Disputes with any of her Enemies. Our Quarrel with Infidels and Socinians wou'd probably be at an End, was that *Reformation of Faith*, which the Separatists so much insist on, compleated. Wou'd the Church comply with them, in this Demand, she wou'd, in all likelihood, silence Socinians and Deists, not by her Arguments, but Concessions.

Thus have we Trac'd this *Serpentine Author*, thro' all the various Folds, and intricate Windings of his Subtle and Sophistical Reasoning; and have, we hope, Demonstrated the Absurdity of the Sectarists Stated Dissent, and Occasional Conformity, the great Guilt of their Hypocrisy and Schism, the Unreasonableness of their Pretended Right to an Unlimited Toleration, and the Vast Dis-service such a Toleration wou'd be to the Government, in Church and State; and, in a word, that this whole Treatise is nothing but Falshood in

Fact,

Fact, and Fallacy in [Argument]. If this Writer shall think fit to Reply, with any more tolerable Sence, Sincerity or Reason, he shall not fail to find the same Just Animadversion, as we have given him already in this Discourse.

In the mean time, if the Church shou'd have this Misfortune, that the *Passing the Occasional Bill*, shou'd, in Defiance of all *Demonstration* to the contrary, be thought still *Unseasonable*, we cannot, but with the greatest Concern for *Christianity* in General, and the Honour and Safety of our Church in particular, earnestly Entreat *those Few of Her Sons*, who have been so far *mis-led*, or *terrify'd*, as to admit any *Schismatical Dissenters Occasionally* to Join with us, in the *Blessed Eucharist*, to call to mind that Excellent *Canon* of our Church, which they are *Bound* and *Sworn* to Obey, And we humbly hope, that whatever may be the *Success* of the *Bill*, on its *Reproposel*, that those *Bishops*, who, in Their *Political Capacities*, as Legislators, cou'd not conceive it *Seasonable*, to give a Suffrage for *That Bill*, will at least, in their *Spiritual Function*, strictly Enjoin Their *Clergy*, in this Thing of so vast Importance to the Church, to Observe their *Canonical Obedience* Inviolable.

---

*Canon 37th, among the Canons made in the Year 1603.  
In the First Year of King James the First.*

*Schismatics not to be Admitted to the Communion.*

“ **N**O Minister, when he celebrateth the Communion, shall wittingly  
 “ Administer the [same to any, but to such as Kneel, under pain of  
 “ Suspension ; nor, under the like pain, to any that refuse to be present at  
 “ Publick Prayers, according to the Orders of the *Church of England* ; nor,  
 “ to any that are common and notorious Depravers of the Book of Com-  
 “ mon Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and of the Orders,  
 “ Rites, and Ceremonies therein prescribed ; or of any thing that is con-  
 “ tain'd in any of the Articles agreed upon in Convocation 1562. or of any  
 “ thing contained in the Book of ordering Priests and Bishops ; or to any  
 “ that have spoken against, and depraved his Majesty's Sovereign Authority  
 “ in Causes Ecclesiastical : Except every such person shall first acknowledge  
 “ to the Minister, before the Church-Wardens, his Repentance for the same,  
 “ and promise by Word (if he cannot Write) that he will do so no more :  
 “ And except (if he can Write) he shall first do the same under his Hand-  
 “ writing, to be deliver'd to the Minister, and by him sent to the Bishop of  
 “ the Diocese, or Ordinary of the Place. Provided, that every Minister so  
 “ repelling any (as is specify'd either in this, or the next precedent Consti-  
 “ tution) shall upon complaint, or being required by the Ordinary, signifie  
 “ the cause thereof unto him, and therein obey his Order and Direction.

*F I N I S.*

pleas'd to Direct that the remaining



# The D

DUBLIN.

**T**HE 13th of June, Mr. Rice Reported from the Committee to take into Consideration of the several Petitions of the several Smiths, for, and in behalf of and the rest of the Protestant Gun-Smiths about the City of Dublin and Kingdom That they had come to several Resolutions he read in his Place, and after deliver'd ble, where the same were again read follow.

Resolv'd, That it is the Opinion of the House, that the Petitioners have Deliver'd in Finance try'd and approv'd Patterns of Patterns.

Resolv'd, That it is the Opinion of the House, that the Petitioners have bought for the said Work.

To which Resolutions the Question being put, the House did agree Nemine Contradictente.

Mr. Jones Reported further, that he by the Committee to move the House, dress may be made to her Majesty, that graciously pleas'd to Direct, that 12500 Arms not already contracted for in Great Britain for the Service of Ireland in this Kingdom.

Resolv'd, Nemine Contradictente, That do Address her Majesty, that she will pleas'd to Direct that the remaining

**Just Publish'd,**  
**In Preach'd in the Cathedral-Church of**  
the 29th of May, in the Year 1710. By the Right Re-  
verend in God, Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum. Printed for  
the Black Swan in Pater-Noster-Row.

**of Lincoln's and Bishop of Norwich's**  
House of Lord's March 17, at the Opening of the 2d  
in Preachment against Dr. Sacheverell. Printed for J.  
Stationer's-Hall, N. B. That these 2 Speeches being  
rule of Peers, are not Printed in the said Dr. Sacheve-

**Just Publish'd,**  
**nion of the Pious and Learned M<sup>rs</sup>.**  
to the Excellent Lady Fackington, concerning the  
free-Obedience, as the Distinguishing Character of the  
and. In a Letter of Her's to a Friend, occasion'd by  
Declaration, that he dy'd in the Beliet thereof.  
ear 1689. Now re-printed, as seasonable for these  
A. Baldwin in Warwick-lane.

**In the Press, A Compleat Course or**  
Mathematicks, Written in French by Monsieur Oza-  
tion to the present King of France, lately printed at  
in English, in 5 Vols. in 8vo, with many Copper Cuts.  
e by Persons well skill'd in the Parts they do; and  
ks are consulted, and where there is occasion Addi-  
rom him at the Bottom of the Page. Note, Two  
printed at Oxon, viz. The Mechanicks, Astronomy,  
at London. Price of the 5 Vols. 1 l. 10. bound.  
taken in by most Booksellers in London and the

**Just Publish'd,**  
**of Salisbury's and the Bishop of Ox-**  
the House of Lords, on the first Article of Impcach-  
ty Sacheverell: Also the Bishop of Lincoln's and  
n's Speeches at the Opening of the 2d Article of the  
Said by J. Mo:phew near Stationer's-Hall. And  
with the Trial of Dr Sacheverell. In Folio. Pr. 8d.

**Just Publish'd,**  
**ry of Resistance, as practis'd by the**  
l: In which is prov'd, from most Authentick Re-  
ery Reign since the Reformation of Religion, the  
Aided and Assist'd, such Subjects as have Defended  
t the Oppressions of their Tyrannical, tho' Natural  
Withers. Printed for J. Robinson at the Golden-  
Church-yard. Price 3d.

**xt Week will be publish'd,**  
**Government; or, A true Balance be-**  
and Liberty, and the advantages of a good In-  
Prince and Parliament. With some Observations  
ice of Parliament-Men, of Publick Officers, Coun-  
l Servants in a Court. Printed for B. Lintott at  
ween the 2 Temple-Gates in Fleetstreet.  
**Now Publish'd,**



